THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXL, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1959

CONTENTS

Is Our Veneration of Our Lady "Mariolatry"? *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 73

The Last Supper: Thursday or Tuesday? Part I. *Robert F. McDonald, S.J.* 79

The Priestly Aspects of Christian Parenthood *Edgar Schmiedler, O.S.B.* 93

The New Testament Designation of the True Church as God's Temple *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 103

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Ornamentation of Chasuble 118

Advent Antiphons 119

Blessing of Ashes at Evening Mass 119

Vernacular Problem 120

The Sale of Contraceptives 120

A Problem in Abstinence 123

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

ANALECTA

The Christmas Message of His Holiness Pope John XXIII . . 125

BOOK REVIEWS

The Catholic Church in the Middle East, *by Raymond Etteldorf* 133

Theology: A Basic Synthesis for the College, *General Editor: Francis L. B. Cunningham, O.P.* 133

The Mass and Liturgical Reform, *by John L. Murphy* 136

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, *edited by Josef Hofer and Karl Rahner* 138

Saint Catherine Laboure of the Miraculous Medal, *by Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M.* 139

Come, O Holy Ghost, *by Adrian Lyons, O.F.M.* 141

BOOK NOTES 142

BOOKS RECEIVED 144

Now available in reprint form—

THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

AN INSTRUCTION CONCERNING SACRED MUSIC AND THE SACRED LITURGY, ACCORDING TO THE ENCYCLICAL LETTERS OF POPE PIUS XII, *MUSICAE SACRAE DISCIPLINA* and *MEDIATOR DEI**

* The translation is that of the NCWC News Service.

(Reprinted from the December 1958 and January 1959 issues of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*)

40 Pages and Cover

Sample copy	65¢
In lots of 5	60¢ ea.
In lots of 10	55¢ ea.
In lots of 25	50¢ ea.

Prices Postpaid

★ ★ ★

The American Ecclesiastical Review

The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.

IS OUR VENERATION OF OUR LADY "MARIOLATRY"?

One of the most frequent objections made by non-Catholics against the Catholic Church is the charge that Catholics in practice are guilty of "Mariolatry." They say that our devotion to Mary is excessive, that we give her the honor that is due only to God by ascribing to her a power and dignity that are actually divine. We attribute our salvation to her rather than to Jesus Christ, they claim. These charges seem to have increased in frequency and in vehemence since Pope Pius XII solemnly defined the doctrine of Mary's Assumption.

The first reaction of many Catholics to such objections is to show resentment, to accuse those who present them with bigotry or ignorance, and to dismiss their arguments with a brief and vigorous reply which often is in no wise an adequate explanation of the topic involved.

To my mind, this is an incorrect—and often uncharitable—way of acting. It is true, some of those who bring up these objections are prejudiced and bigoted; but I believe that many others who question Catholics about their devotion to the Blessed Virgin are sincerely disturbed about the way in which some Catholics speak and act in relation to the Mother of God. They are not actually ignorant or bigoted, but are honestly seeking enlightenment about our attitude toward Mary. And they have a right to an answer which will be clear and exact and which will correctly explain the matter to anyone who is honest and intelligent.

In the first place, let us admit without hesitation that there are some Catholics whose manner of devotion toward Our Lady is not in accordance with sound Catholic teaching and practice, and can justly be said to be exaggerated and excessive. I have seen Catholics enter a church and go directly to the altar of Our Lady without any recognition of the Blessed Sacrament; and when their devotions to Mary were ended they left the church without making even a genuflection toward the tabernacle. Doubtless it was to rectify such an unfortunate custom that the Holy See, in 1923, granted an indulgence to those who, on entering a church, proceed *at once* to the altar of the Blessed Sacrament and make even a brief adoration there.[1] In Europe I have seen churches in which the altar of Mary was ablaze with light and adorned with fragrant flowers, while the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, hidden in some obscure corner, had no other adornment than a sanctuary light and a tabernacle veil. There were many persons kneeling before the former, very few before the latter.

Surely, this is not right, nor is it consistent with our repeated statements that honor is due in the first place to God, that He alone is worthy of *latria* while Our Lady receives only *hyperdulia,* that her place in the economy of salvation is to lead us to God, etc. And it can easily happen that sincere non-Catholics, seeing the emphasis that the practices we have described put on devotion to Mary to the apparent neglect of the adoration that we owe to God, could be scandalized and could be deterred from further investigation of the Catholic faith.

Moreover, I believe that when priests are publicly speaking about Our Lady they should refrain from statements which, though they can be interpreted correctly and may even be found in reputable theological manuals, are very likely to be misunderstood by the hearers, who will accordingly conceive a false notion about the Catholic teaching on Our Lady. For example, the expression "We can never praise Mary too highly" (which I believe is the sense of *De Maria nunquam satis*) might be taken literally and the conclusion drawn that we can ascribe infinite power and dignity to the Mother of God—though this axiom is perfectly true in the sense that we can never fully comprehend and express the greatness of Mary's grace and glory. Again, there is an axiom that is found in some theology textbooks, "What God can do by His command, thou, O Virgin canst do by thy prayer" *(Quod Deus imperio, tu prece, Virgo, potes).* This axiom might lead some to conclude that according to Catholic teaching Mary is equal to God—the very charge which non-Catholics are constantly making and which we are constantly denying.

However, the fact that some Catholics practice an exaggerated devotion to Our Lady and the fact that expressions are sometimes used in reference to her which may be misunderstood should not deter Catholics, both priests and people, from cultivating toward Mary a devotion that is fully in accord with the teaching of the Church, despite the attacks and the ridicule of some non-Catholics. On the contrary, these circumstances make it all the more necessary that Catholics should have a clear and adequate understanding of the basis of the honor the Church renders to Mary, so that their own devotional practices will be properly regulated and they will be enabled to give a correct explanation of the Catholic attitude toward Our Lady to non-Catholics who question them on this matter.

---

[1] *Raccolta,* n. 147.

It is difficult to see how anyone who admits the fundamental Christian doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ can fail to admit the reasonableness of the honor paid to Mary by the Catholic Church. Sincere non-Catholics who do not grant the force of tradition or the infallible teaching authority of the Church will not concede some of the privileges ascribed to Mary by Catholics as proved facts, but at least they should admit that Catholic doctrine and practice in respect to the Blessed Virgin are not absurd or derogatory to the adoration due to God, but on the contrary are quite reasonable and consistent with Christian principles. Of course, this supposes that the Catholic attitude toward Mary is explained to these persons exactly and adequately. And this means that priests must themselves be fully familiar with the Church's teaching on Our Lady and must make it the matter of frequent instruction to their people.

Mary is truly the Mother of God. That is the fundamental reason for the great honor we give her. For if God conferred on her this dignity, far superior to any privilege given to men or angels, why should we not honor her as the most exalted of creatures? At the same time, we may not forget that she is a mere creature and that there is an infinity between her excellence and that of God. Actually, whenever we honor her our intention is to extend that honor to Him who gratuitously chose her for the high office of Mother of God. To neglect the adoration due to her Son through exaggerated esteem for her would be entirely contrary to the true Catholic attitude. Our devotion should never stop with her but should be a stepping-stone to the worship and love of her Divine Son—*per Mariam ad Jesum.* This has been magnificently illustrated at Lourdes during the past century. The prayers and processions that Mary sought from Bernadette are nowadays mainly those that honor Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. This does not mean less veneration of Our Lady; but it means more adoration of her Son.

When priests explain the doctrine of the divine maternity, it is vitally important that they point out the significance of the word "God" in the title "Mother of God." I believe that there is much misunderstanding of this title on the part of non-Catholics, which is the basis of their refusal to call Mary the Mother of God. They think that in giving this title to Mary we attribute to her a real motherhood of the Godhead in its Trinity—the three Divine Persons possessing the divine nature from all eternity. Of course, such an interpretation is utterly absurd—heretical, as far as Catholic faith is concerned. The word "God" in Mary's most glorious title signifies only one of the three divine Persons, and not according to the divine nature which He possesses in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost, but according to the created human nature which He alone assumed at the Incarnation. In the words of St. Thomas: "The Blessed Virgin is called the Mother of God, not because she is the mother of the divinity, but because she is the mother of a person possessing divinity and humanity and is mother according to the humanity . . . The name 'God,' although it is common to the three persons, nevertheless sometimes signifies only the person of the Father, sometimes only the person of the Son or of the Holy Ghost. Thus, when we say: 'The Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God' this name 'God' signifies only the person of the Son Incarnate."[2]

It is just as correct to say that Mary is the Mother of God as it is to say that God walked the streets of Palestine and God died on the cross. It is difficult to see how any intelligent non-Catholic can deny the logic of this conclusion—at least, if he believes that Jesus Christ is a divine Person. And once this is admitted, it is easy to perceive why Mary is worthy of great honor as the most highly favored of all creatures. And it should also be easy to realize that it was most fitting (even abstracting from revelation and the teaching of the Church) that God should bestow on her extraordinary privileges, such as the Immaculate Conception and the bodily Assumption.

[2] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica,* III^{a}, q. 35, a. 4, *ad* 2, 3.

This is the basic reason for the veneration which Catholics give to Mary, because she is truly the Mother of God—a doctrine solemnly defined by the Church in the Council of Ephesus in 431. It is good for Protestants to know that the title "Mother of God" (θεοτόκος) was in use among Christians in the third century —thirteen centuries before Protestantism began. But there is another reason for the devotion of Catholics to Mary, particularly for their custom of praying to her in all their needs. It is based on the undeniable fact that Mary participated in the work of man's redemption. She freely accepted the function of Mother of the Redeemer,[3] she protected her Son from the murderous designs of Herod,[4] she induced Him to perform the first of the miracles by which He proved His divine mission,[5] she accompanied Him to Calvary and stood beneath the cross as He died in agony.[6] Certainly, it is most reasonable to infer that this holy woman wholeheartedly consented to all that the divine plan of redemption demanded of her Son and united her prayers and sufferings to His for the salvation of the human race. And if she took so important a part in the acquisition of graces for the salvation of mankind, is it not reasonable to conclude that she is granted by the Almighty some participation in the distribution of those graces to individual souls from her exalted place in heaven? Indeed, is it not very logical to infer that she has some share in the distribution of every supernatural grace granted to men, since she had a share in the gaining of every grace—in other words, that she is the Mediatress of all graces?

This is not, indeed, an article of Catholic faith, though it is commonly accepted by Catholics; and many theologians (including myself) believe that it is contained implicitly in the deposit of divine revelation and could be defined by the Church. However, at present the non-Catholic who denies it is not rejecting a solemn teaching of the Church, as does one who denies that Mary is truly the Mother of God. Of course, Mary's mediatorship does not mean that she has the power to confer supernatural grace herself. For supernatural grace is a participation in the nature of God Himself, and hence can be conferred directly only by God as the principal cause, through an operation of the divine nature. Mary obtains graces for us only by her prayers. Her mediatorship is not derogatory to the unique mediatorship of Jesus Christ; for her power to obtain graces for human beings, like her sanctity, depends entirely on the merits of her Divine Son. All these truths are contained in the doctrine of Mary's mediatorship, and should be explained clearly to Catholics by their priests. It is difficult to see how any unprejudiced person to whom this doctrine is properly explained can regard it as unreasonable or blasphemous or an example of "Mariolatry," even though he does not admit it himself.

---

[3] *Luke,* 1: 38.

[4] *Matth.,* 2:14.

[5] *John,* 2: 4.

[6] *John,* 19: 25.

I wonder how many non-Catholics (and Catholics, for that matter) realize that anyone who believes in Jesus Christ as our Redeemer is really admitting a principle that enters essentially into the Catholic belief in the efficacy of Mary's intercession. For the Christian belief in the redemptive work of Jesus Christ means that through the *created humanity* of Jesus Christ God willed to save mankind using that humanity as an instrument of divine power and mercy. Now, the Catholic practice of recourse to Mary's intercession is based on the belief that through her, mere creature though she is, God wills to bestow graces on mankind, using her as an instrument subordinate to the instrumental causality of Jesus Christ. It is true, the humanity of Christ, hypostatically united to the Person of the Word, is infinitely superior to Mary. He alone could adequately merit and satisfy for the human race; her very power of prayer comes from His redemptive activity. Nevertheless, the principle involved in both is the same—God has willed to sanctify and save men through created instruments. Those who say: "I will not seek graces through Mary because she is a creature" are completely inconsistent if, at the same time, they pray to Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate, and acknowledge Him as their Saviour because of His suffering in human flesh.

All Catholics should be familiar with these Catholic principles and their practical application, for only then will they have a correct understanding of Mary's place in the economy of man's redemption and of the way we should venerate her and ask her intercession, only then will they be able to refute the unjust charge that true Catholic devotion to Our Lady is "Mariolatry."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE LAST SUPPER: THURSDAY OR TUESDAY?

I.

Until recently work on the problem of dating the Last Supper was pretty much concerned with an internal criticism of the text of the Gospels. While there has always been external testimony of one form or another to assist the work, it manifests the same state of confusion as the Gospel narratives themselves on this point. An example of this state of affairs can be found in the answers given this question: Did Our Lord eat a paschal meal before His death, or did He not? The synoptic Gospels seem to say He did, but how could He, when He died before the legal day for such a meal?[1] On the other hand, if Our Lord did not eat the paschal meal, then we are at a loss to explain the synoptic accounts. Some exegetes have settled for one horn of the dilemma, men like St. Hippolytus (ca. 222),[2] St. Peter Alexandrinus (ca. 300),[3] and Claudius Apollinaris of Hieropolis (ca. 161),[4] who all said Our Lord did not eat a paschal meal, the Gospels notwithstanding. Others took the other horn, the author of the *Didascalia,*[5] and St. Irenaeus (ca. 200), for example.[6] In 1954 Mlle. Annie Jaubert published an article saying, in effect, that you could escape injury, if you took both horns of the dilemma.[7] Her paper presented a real breakthrough toward the solution of the problem: Our Lord celebrated the Last Supper on Tuesday of Holy Week; it was a paschal meal, and on a day legally recognized for the celebration of the Pasch by an older calendar than the one in common use in Our Lord's day.

MLLE. ANNIE JAUBERT

In the following pages I shall explain how Mlle. Jaubert attempts to prove her claims, and I shall comment on different points as we go along. But first, a few words about Mlle. Jaubert herself. She is an assistant professor at the Sorbonne and a member of two scientific organizations, the *Centre national de la recherche scientifique,* and the *École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem.* She has a book coming out on the Last Supper which will probably deal more extensively with the problem covered in three articles she has published so far.[8] The first article established the biblical origins of the older calendar Our Lord must have used in celebrating the Pasch on Tuesday of Holy Week.[9] The second article was published in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions* for the following year, 1954. It is this article which concerns us here and now.

---

[1] *Matt.* 26:17; *Mark* 14:12; *Luke* 22:8.

[2] F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1901-2), I, 194*.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 154.

[4] *PG,* 92, 78. *Chronicon paschale,* 5.

[5] M. D. Gibson, *Didascalia apostolorum* (London: C. J. Clay, 1903).

[6] Irenaeus, *Contra haereses,* Book II, c. 22 (*PG,* 7:783).

[7] Jaubert, "La date de la dernière cène," *Revue de l'histoire des religions,* 146 (1954), 140-173.

AN OUTLINE

Before going into details, a brief sketch of Jaubert's thesis wili be helpful. She compares the evidence for both the Tuesday tradition and the present Thursday tradition for the celebration of the Last Supper. Both traditions seem to date back to the early second century, but there is this difference between them: the Thursday tradition is supported only by an interpretation of the Gospel texts, St. John for the most part, whereas the Tuesday tradition is supported by sources independent of the Gospels, and these independent sources help us reconcile the apparent contradictions found in the Gospel accounts. The main independent sources for the Tuesday tradition are the *Didascalia apostolorum* and the old sacerdotal calendar contained in the apocryphal book of *Jubilees* or *Little Genesis.* It is Jaubert's contention that Thursday is more of a deduction from the Gospels, than a real tradition.[10]

---

[8] The book has already appeared in France under the title: *La date de la cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957). It has been reviewed by the following: H. M. Feret, O.P., *La maison-Dieu,* 52 (1957), 141-6; John A. O'Flynn, "The Date of the Last Supper," *The Irish Theological Quarterly,* 25 (1958), 58-63; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Date of the Last Supper," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* 20 (1958), 192-9.

[9] Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques," *Vetus Testamentum,* 3 (1953), 250-64.

[10] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 153. Wherever possible I shall try to give the corresponding reference to Jaubert's book of note 8 under the title of *The Book* to avoid confusion with the article of the same name. Here: *The Book,* p. 96.

THE DIDASCALIA

At the outset Jaubert presents several passages from the *Didascalia,* commenting at length on three of them. She is using the edition of F. Nau, *La didascalie,* so the sections will be numbered according to that edition. All the passages are from chapter twenty-one.[11] This is the first passage:

> . . . XIV, 5. After eating the Pasch, on *Tuesday evening,* we went to the Mount of Olives, and, during the night, they took Our Lord Jesus prisoner. 6. On the following day, that is on *Wednesday,* He was kept under guard at the house of the high priest, Caiphas; the very same day, the leaders of the people assembled and held council concerning Him. 7. On the next day, *Thursday,* they brought Him before the governor, Pilate, and they held Him under lock and key at the governor's palace during the night. 8. On *Friday morning,* they brought many charges against Him in front of Pilate. They were unable to prove any of them to be true, but they produced false witnesses to testify against Him, and they demanded that Pilate put Him to death. 9. They crucified Him on that very day, Friday, and He suffered hanging on the cross for six hours.

A second passage apparently in Our Lord's own words:

> . . . XIV, 18. . . . You will fast for them (on behalf of the Jews) on Wednesday, because it is on *Wednesday* that they began to destroy their souls, when they arrested Me. 19. Tuesday night is really part of Wednesday, as it is written: It was evening, and it was morning, one day. So the evening belongs to the following day. 20. On *Tuesday evening,* I ate my Pasch with you, and, during the night, they took Me prisoner. . . . 21. Fast for them on Friday also, because on that day, they crucified Me. . . .

And a third passage of which Jaubert makes much as we shall see:

> . . . XVII, 2. On the tenth day of the lunar month—which we compute as the faithful Hebrew does—[on the tenth day, again] which was Monday, the priests and elders of the people assembled and came together in the main hall of Caiphas the high priest: they held council for the purpose of seizing Jesus and killing Him, but they were fearful and said: "Not on a festival day, for fear that the people would become excited; because everyone thought highly of Him. . . ." (Judas tried

---

[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 142-4; *The Book,* pp. 82-4.

to find an opportunity to betray Jesus into their hands.) . . . 6. Because of the great crowds of people (Jews), from every city and town, who went up to the Temple in order to celebrate the Pasch at Jerusalem, the priests and the elders considered the situation carefully, and subsequently ordered that the feast be celebrated without delay, so that they could seize Him without causing a riot. So the inhabitants of Jerusalem offered sacrifice, and were busy eating their Paschal meal before the other people from outside the city had a chance to arrive, all because they the leaders had changed the days for the feast. For this reason they were accused by God (who said to them): You deceive yourselves in everything. 7. They celebrated the Pasch then, three days too soon, on the eleventh day of the lunar month, *Tuesday;* because they said: Everyone is falling into error following Him; now that we have the chance, let us seize Him, and when all the people finally arrive, let us put Him to death publicly, so that everyone will clearly see his mistake, and turn away from Him.

CRITICISM

Jaubert considers the *Didascalia* to be a hodge-podge sort of document containing many disparate elements.[12] It is an odd assortment of quotations from different sources, representing different traditions.[13] To get down to details, the first two quotations clearly indicate Tuesday as the day of the Last Supper. The first gives a complete chronology of the events for the rest of the week, so that there can hardly be any room for error in mistaking the symbols used in the Syriac text to indicate the different days of the week. The second quotation represents for Jaubert an older tradition than the others. It contains a reference to one of the oldest liturgical usages of the Jews, a preference for Wednesdays and Fridays as fast days to all the other days of the week.[14] How old a tradition does the passage represent? We cannot say for certain. Nau considers the *Didascalia* to have been written in the early part of the third century, but there are indications that some of the material contained in it is as early as Clement of Rome in the first century.[15]

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 144; *The Book*, p. 84.

[13] F. Nau, "Didascalie," *DTC*, 4, 734-48.

[14] Jaubert, *La date*, p. 145; *The Book*, p. 85. On p. 153 Jaubert cites the argumentation of K. Holl on this point; *The Book*, p. 92.

[15] F. Nau, *DTC*, 4, 741.

With reference to the third passage, Jaubert considers this to be simply a later effort on the part of the editor of the *Didascalia* to explain the Tuesday tradition. He makes no attempt to deny it, but he does not know the foundation for it, so he conjectures that the pharisees and priests decided to move up the date of the Pasch and kill Our Lord almost before the Jews from outside Jerusalem had a chance to arrive.[16] In the light of subsequent argumentation which Jaubert presents to prove the Jews had every resaon to hold a full-scale trial, the efforts of the editor of the *Didascalia* to avoid this do seem rather unnecessary.[17] However, this *a priori* argumentation is not the strongest point Jaubert makes against this difficult passage in the *Didascalia.* The calendar of the *Jubilees,* which she takes up later on, is the real basis for the Tuesday tradition.[18]

Before going further with Mlle. Jaubert's presentation, a few further remarks concerning the *Didascalia* would seem to be in order here to help us evaluate the document properly. It is an early description of the Church's discipline originally written in Greek. What we have now is not the Greek original, but a number of translations of which the Syriac used by Jaubert is considered by some to be the most reliable. Without calling its historical value into question or attempting thereby to weaken Jaubert's position, it seems only fair to state that the text of the *Didascalia* is not based on anything like the manuscript tradition of the Gospels. Mrs. Gibson makes use of only two manuscripts for the most part in her edition of the *Didascalia.*[19] Furthermore, in the Ethiopic version of J. M. Harden,[20] which seems to be a descendant of the Syriac and contains roughly the same material,[21] not only is there no mention of a Tuesday tradition, but there is definite mention of Thursday as the day of the Last Supper.[22] Just what is the relationship of these two versions of the *Didascalia?* Which is really the more acceptable of the two? In the introduction to Harden's edition an attempt has been made to bring some sort of order to all the documents which go by the name of *Didascalia,* but it is only too clear that much remains to be done in this area.[23] It does not seem possible, therefore, to say which version is preferable. From Mlle. Jaubert's point of view though, the Ethiopic version is an inconvenient thing to have around.

---

[16] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 146; *The Book,* p. 86.

[17] *Ibid.,* pp. 162-3; *The Book,* pp. 123 ff.

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 155 ff.; *The Book,* pp. 13-75.

[19] Gibson, *op. cit.,* Part I, Introduction, p. v.

[20] J. M. Harden, *The Ethiopic Didascalia* (London: Macmillan, 1920).

[21] *Ibid.,* Introduction, p. xv.

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 124.

Besides these remarks on the level of textual criticism, it might be admissible to make one observation on the authenticity of the *Didascalia.* Mrs. Gisbon goes along with the opinion of de Lagarde and others that the *Didascalia* was written by one or other member of an heretical sect called the Audeans.[24] Mlle. Jaubert would seem to go along with this opinion, too, since it is contained in the introduction to her (Nau's) edition of the *Didascalia* in a quotation from Epiphanius (ca. 400).[25] While it cannot be denied that Epiphanius treats of the *Didascalia* in connection with the Audeans and recognizes their knowledge of the document, nevertheless it seems that he questions this Audean provenience in one place in his works:

> . . . The Audeans seek to strengthen their own position by drawing to it some of the authority behind the Apostolic Constitution. Although some people consider this book not to be trustworthy, it should not be discredited. Everything that has to do with Church discipline is contained in it. It has nothing in it contrary to the Catholic profession of faith, or contrary to the administrative decrees of the Church. But with reference to that passage from which they attempt to strengthen their own opinion concerning the Pasch, this is something which they misinterpret and in their ignorance they make it mean something it does not mean . . .[26]

Mrs. Gibson picks up the quotation from this point where it seems that Epiphanius attributes the *Didascalia* to the Apostles:

> . . . for the Apostles define in that Constitution that ye reckon not, but observe (it) when your brethren from the circumcision do; do so together with them; and they did not say "when your brethren *in* the circumcision," but "those *from* the circumcision," that they might show

---

[23] *Ibid.,* Introduction, pp. vii-xxiii.

[24] Gibson, *op. cit.,* Introduction, p. v. On the Audeans cf. also *DTC,* I-2, 2266.

[25] *Ibid.,* p. v. Cf. also Jaubert, *La date,* p. 146; *The Book,* p. 87.

[26] Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses,* lib. 3, tom. 1, Haeres 70 (*PG,* 42, 355).

that those who had come over into the Church from the circumcision were leaders after that time.[27]

However, granting for the sake of argument that the *Didascalia* does come from the Audean sect, what influence did this exert over the nature of the work itself? Does it make it more or less reliable? Was the control of this small, ostracized group over its environment and its productive work such that it could hand on to us a critical document? Did they even intend to do so? It does not seem possible to answer these questions at the moment, but at least they seem to merit consideration and comment, especially so when one wishes to base a theory on the validity of the *Didascalia*.

To sum up then on this point in Mlle. Jaubert's thesis: it is clear that the Syriac version of the *Didascalia* does support the Tuesday tradition for the Last Supper and that this tradition dates from the second century. Jaubert also recognizes the nature of the document as being one of uneven quality. My observations on the matter have been prompted by the feeling that she has not presented an evaluation of the *Didascalia* which is satisfying on all points.

In connection with the *Didascalia* Jaubert cites the corroborative, though not independent, testimony of Epiphanius, the bishop of Salamis (ca. 400). We have remarked on this already, and it seems necessary now only to notice the conclusion Jaubert comes to here. She observes that one can judge from the implicit faith Epiphanius puts in the *Didascalia* that he must have had more to go on than just the literary tradition represented by the *Didascalia* itself.[28] In other words, the Tuesday tradition must have been so commonly accepted that Epiphanius does not think it worth commenting on. He does not even consider calling it into question.

FURTHER EVIDENCE FOR TUESDAY

Before taking up the evidence for the Thursday tradition Jaubert brings up two further points.[29] She first mentions the testimony of Victorinus of Pettau, bishop of Styria, who died in 304. Secondly, she considers the evidence of liturgical expressions that were in use during the first four centuries of Christianity.

---

[27] Gibson, *op. cit.*, part II, Introduction, p. vii.

[28] Jaubert, *La date*, p. 147; *The Book*, p. 89.

[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 148-9; *The Book*, p. 89 and p. 95.

The bishop of Styria wrote a small work called the *De Fabrica Mundi.* In it he makes a statement about Our Lord's being taken prisoner on Tuesday of Holy Week. If one bears in mind the Jewish way of reckoning a day from six o'clock the evening before until six o'clock in the evening of the day itself,[30] then it will become clear that Victorinus is speaking of Tuesday in the following:

> . . . The Man, Christ Jesus, Author of those things we mentioned above, was seized by wicked men on the fourth day of the week. So because of His captivity of the fourth day, and on account of the greatness of His works we fast until vespers of that day or extend it until the following day, it being a time salutary for mankind, rich with fruit, and without storm.[31]

Jaubert holds Victorinus to be independent of the *Didascalia.*[32] Hausleiter would seem to agree with her since he makes no mention of any such dependence in the prolegomena to his edition of the *De Fabrica Mundi.* Bardy takes Victorinus back to an Eastern origin and maintains that he was influenced by Origen and Hippolytus, but he makes no mention of anything owed to the *Didascalia.*[33]

The only comment I wish to make concerning Victorinus is this: The *De Fabrica Mundi* is a highly allegorical work, at least in the section quoted above and referred to by Jaubert.[34] The author is trying to heap up arguments in praise of the number "four" and the "fourth" day of the week. Just how far can such a work be trusted? Are all the examples pressed into service of equal validity? Specifically, is this instance of Our Lord's seizure on Tuesday night historically credible in the context of the rest of the document? It is hard to say, but it is a point for Mlle. Jaubert to look into.

In considering the evidence as presented to us by the liturgical formulae and books of the early Christian era, Jaubert remarks that nothing substantiating the Thursday tradition presents itself until the second half of the fourth century.[35] Instead of the formula we have today in the Canon of the Mass: "Qui *pridie* quam pateretur, accepit panem. . . ," which obviously refers to the Thursday tradition, we keep running into the noncommittal phrase: "The night on which He was betrayed. . . ."[36] Now this proves neither one way nor the other *prima facie,* but in the face of today's formula and the strongly entrenched position of the Thursday tradition, it does seem to be a point in favor of the Tuesday tradition that nothing resembling our present usage existed in the primitive Church.

---

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 143; *The Book,* p. 83. Cf. also *Gen.* 1:5.

[31] *Victorini episcopi Petavionensis opera,* edited by J. Haussleiter (Vindobonae, 1916), p. 4, #3 (*CSEL,* 49).

[32] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 148; *The Book,* p. 89.

[33] G. Bardy, "Victorin de Pettau," *DTC,* XV-2, 2882-87.

[34] Cf. also on this point Sr. Mary J. Suelzer, *Julianus Pomerius* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1947), p. 193, note 70.

Jaubert certainly seems to be right in her observations concerning the liturgical formulae current in the primitive Church, but Cabrol and Leclercq quote a great number of expressions seemingly in favor of the legal calendar of Our Lord's day, a calendar which is used in St. John's Gospel and which is, as we shall see, behind the Thursday tradition.[37] Cabrol and Leclercq do not pretend to furnish us with a critical text of these liturgical expressions, and they are not an easy source of material to deal with, but in the absence of such a critical evaluation, I cannot see that they prove one way or the other at this moment. Perhaps that is all Mlle. Jaubert desires for now.

THE THURSDAY TRADITION

Having presented the testimony in favor of the Tuesday tradition, the next point that Mlle. Jaubert takes up is the evidence for the Thursday tradition. She cites passages from St. Irenaeus (ca. 200), Apollinaris of Hieropolis (ca. 165), and Clement of Alexandria (ca. 200). The important point to bear in mind is her insistence that their testimony amounts to nothing more than an interpretation of the Gospel accounts.[38]

In his *Adversus Haereses* II, 22, St. Irenaeus writes as follows:

> When He had raised Lazarus from the dead, and while the Pharisees were plotting to trap Him, He went away to the city of Ephrem: and

---

[35] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 149.

[36] E.g., *I Cor.* 11:24.

[37] Cabrol and Leclercq, *op. cit.,* pp. 148 ff., and pp. 152 ff., but especially p. 195*.

[38] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 153; *The Book,* p. 96.

> from that place ***six days before the Pasch*** He came to Bethany, and from Bethany He went up to Jerusalem, ***ate the Pasch, and suffered on the following day.***[39]

The passage just quoted does bear out Jaubert's position. It is a deduction from the Gospels. The first phrase italicized (italicizing my own) is from St. John's Gospel, 12:1. The second phrase, although contained nowhere as such in the Gospel narratives of the Passion, resembles closely *John* 13:1.[40] We have already remarked in passing that St. John's Gospel seems to be the basis for the Thursday tradition.[41] Jaubert takes this up in detail later on.[42]

Irenaeus does more than simply appeal to the Gospel of St. John. He cites the example of the predecessors of Pope St. Victor, going as far back as Sixtus (ca. 119). In a letter to Victor agreeing with him against Polycrates on the celebration of Easter and recorded for us by Eusebius, he speaks as follows (letter written ca. 198):

> . . . Finally, he said, all the popes before the time of Soter, who ruled the Church as you do now, I mean Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus and Sixtus, they and their followers disagreed with them [with Polycrates and his followers], and did not follow the same observance. Yet they were always at peace with the churches, which did follow this observance.[43]

The last citation does not immediately bear upon the question of the Last Supper, but it does support Jaubert's position that the old sacerdotal calendar was used at Rome at a very early date.[44] The important characteristic of this calendar of *Jubilees* is that feast days fell on the same day every year, and this is what Pope St. Victor maintained against Polycrates with reference to Easter, that it was a fixed feast.

---

[39] Irenaeus, *op. cit.,* Book II, c. 22 (*PG,* 7, 783). Cf. also Jaubert, *La date,* p. 150; *The Book,* p. 96.

[40] F. P. Dutripon, *Concordantiae bibliorum sacrorum* (Prati, 1861), pp. 1360-61; cf. *"sequor."*

[41] Cf. note 37 supra.

[42] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 157 ff.; *The Book,* pp. 109 ff.

[43] Eusebius, *Kirchengeschichte,* Book V, c. 24, nos. 9-25 (*GCS,* IX, part 1, pp. 495-97). Cf. also *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (ed. 1951), XVII, 225, for the chronology of these popes.

[44] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 170; *The Book,* p. 111.

The second witness Jaubert brings forward for the Thursday tradition is Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia about the year 165. In an obscure work of unknown origin called the *Chronicon paschale* he is quoted as follows:

> . . . Some people, he says, stir up disagreements on the subject of the Pasch "because of their ignorance. They say that, on the fourteenth day [of the month], the Lord ate the [paschal] lamb with His disciples, and that He suffered on the great feast of the unleavened bread; they pretend that Matthew says the same thing. But their opinion is contrary to the law, and introduces a contradiction into the gospels."[45]

Jaubert admits this author is not conclusive. Certainly it is not easy to see what he means when he says: "But their opinion is contrary to the Law." Is he referring to the fact that Our Lord could not legally have eaten the Pasch at all, because He died before the legal day? If so, he does seem to depend on the Johannine tradition here, and reductively he would support the Thursday tradition. It is worth noting here that St. John seems to studiously avoid using the word Pasch.[46] The point of Apollinaris's dependence on John becomes slightly clearer in view of his remark: ". . . and they pretend that Matthew says what they think." Apollinaris rejects an interpretation of St. Matthew here, and in so doing he rejects the Synoptics, who support the Tuesday tradition, when they maintain that Our Lord ate the Pasch.[47]

The passage Jaubert cites from Apollinaris is to be found in column 80 of *PG,* vol. XCII. Two columns back (col. 78) there is a clearer statement in favor of Thursday, although it is not clear that Apollinaris is speaking here:

> . . . After He [Our Lord] finished His [life of] preaching, He did not eat a lamb, but He Himself suffered as the true Lamb on the Paschal feast, as the theologian and evangelist John teaches us in the Gospel he wrote [*John* 18:28]. . . . On the day therefore that the Jews were to eat the Pasch Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was crucified . . . at the time when Our Lord and God Jesus Christ suffered

---

[45] *Ibid.,* p. 151; *The Book,* pp. 96-7.

[46] *John* 13:2: "et *coena* facta . . ."; and *John* 13:4: "surgit a *coena* . . ."; and these expressions just after mentioning the Pasch in *John* 13:1: "ante diem festum *Paschae*. . . ."

[47] *Matt.* 26:17; *Mark* 14:12; *Luke* 22:8.

> for us according to the flesh, He did not eat the legal Pasch, but, as I said, He as the true Lamb was offered up for us on the eve of the Paschal feast, the fourteenth day of the first lunar month.

Whether or not the last passage is from Apollinaris is not too important here. What is important is the way in which it is connected to the passage Jaubert has quoted:

> . . . And Apollinaris, the holy bishop of Hieropolis in Asia Minor, who was close to the time of the Apostles, in a book which he wrote on the Pasch taught the same thing in the following words. . . .[48]

Granting for the sake of argument the authenticity of the *Chronicon paschale,* the above passage helps to fit Apollinaris into a context which is properly recognized as support for the Thursday tradition. Again, bear in mind that his testimony is, as Jaubert insists, based on the Gospels.

The last source Mlle. Jaubert draws upon to establish the Thursday tradition is Clement of Alexandria (ca. 200). From the same *Chronicon paschale* she quotes this somewhat confused passage:

> . . . "In previous years the Lord ate the Pasch sacrificed by the Jews and He celebrated the feast. But, after finishing His [life of] preaching, He who was the Pasch, the Lamb of God led like a sheep to the slaughter, taught His disciples the mystery of this symbolism on the thirteenth day of the month when they asked Him: *Where do you want us to prepare the Pasch for you?* On this day the sanctification of the unleavened bread and the preparation of the feast took place. . . . Our Lord suffered the *next day,* He who was the Pasch offered by the Jews. . . . Consequently, on the fourteenth [day of the month] when He suffered, the leaders, priests, and scribes led Him to Pilate but *did not enter the praetorium that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Pasch,* in the evening without hindrance. Upon this reckoning of the days all of the Scriptures and the Gospels are in accord."[49]

In the passage just quoted Jaubert has underlined the words "the next day" which seem to indicate clearly that Clement holds the

---

[48] *Chronicon paschale,* 6 (*PG,* 92, 79).

[49] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 151; *The Book,* p. 97. Jaubert has changed to another edition of the *Chronicon paschale* here which seems to include it among the works of Clement of Alexandria: *Clemens Alexandrinus* (Leipzig: O. Staehlin, 1909), III, 216 (*GCS,* 17).

Thursday tradition. I have italicized the two longer statements. The first is from the synoptic accounts of the Passion.[50] The second is from the Gospel of St. John.[51] The last sentence of the quotation seems to show that Clement either was very anxious to make the Synoptics agree with John, or that he knew how they actually were to be reconciled. We cannot say at this point, but it does seem to cloud the issue a bit, inasmuch as Jaubert will later bring out the difference between John and the Synoptics. John supports the Thursday tradition: the Synoptics Tuesday. What side was Clement taking then? If he takes the Synoptics, he should be a Tuesday man; if he follows St. John, he should be a Thursday man.[52] From the passage itself it is hard to tell, despite the words "the next day."

We can get some light on the subject, if we notice the phrase used in connection with the quotation from the Synoptics: "the mystery of this symbolism." From this I think we can see what Clement is doing with the quotation from the Synoptics. He takes from it its literal meaning, which is that Our Lord ate a paschal meal, and interprets it allegorically. In so doing he brings the Synoptics over to the Johannine tradition: Our Lord ate no paschal meal, because He Himself was the Pasch. It seems that we can at this point more readily accept Jaubert's position here, that Clement stands for the Thursday tradition.

What is possibly more interesting is to see that not only does Clement argue for Thursday from the Gospels themselves, but he reconciles all differences and apparent contradictions by treating one part of the Gospels allegorically, and other parts literally. He has no recourse apparently to external evidence like Jaubert's calendar. More than anything else Jaubert's claim concerning the Thursday tradition is borne out by observing Clement's method of exegesis. It seems to be entirely confined to the Scriptures.

Within the first break in Jaubert's quotation from Clement of Alexandria there is a definite reference to John's Gospel. It is strange that Jaubert left it out since it helps to place Clement as a Thursday man. It may be Clement who is responsible for the phrase "on the next day He suffered" which he here puts in the mouth of St. John:[53] "And so when on this day the disciples had been properly prepared for purification by the Lord, John went on to write: 'He suffered on the next day. . . .' "[54]

---

[50] *Matt.* 26:17; *Mark* 14:12; *Luke* 22:9.

[51] *John* 18:28.

[52] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 157; *The Book,* pp. 105 ff.

SUMMATION

At this point Jaubert sums up her findings concerning the Thursday tradition.[55] The point about it all resting on a deduction from the Gospels has been sufficiently emphasized. What she adds here is that we can date the Thursday tradition back to the second century, so that from the state of the evidence thus far, we can say that both traditions seem to be of equal antiquity.[56] We have already dated the works of Irenaeus, Apollinaris, and Clement of Alexandria. Jaubert adds the testimony of Eusebius with reference to Clement's and Apollinaris' testimony.[57] Eusebius believed that Clement depended largely on the lost work of Melito of Sardis written about 165.[58] The date for Apollinaris is given by the proconsulate of Servillius Paulus at Laodicea between 164 and 168.[59] Since we have dated the *Didascalia,* the main source for the Tuesday tradition, as also from the second century, both traditions seem to be of the same age.[60] The difference between them is this: the Thursday tradition is based on the Gospels, but we do not know the basis of the Tuesday tradition as found in the *Didascalia.* This Jaubert believes to be the calendar of Jubilees, and we shall next turn to see what use she makes of this.

(To be continued)

ROBERT F. McDONALD, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

---

[53] Cf. spura, note 40.

[54] Cabrol and Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 108. Cf. also: *PG,* 92, 82.

[55] Jaubert, *La date,* pp. 152-3; *The Book,* pp. 101-2.

[56] Cf. supra.

[57] Jaubert, *La date,* p. 152; *The Book,* p. 98.

[58] Eusebius, *op. cit.,* Book IV, c. 26, no. 4 (*GCS,* vol. 9, part 1, pp. 382-3), and also Book VI, c. 13, no. 9 (*GCS,* vol. 9, part 2, pp. 548-9).

[59] *Ibid.,* Book IV, c. 26, no. 3 (*GCS,* vol. 9, part 1, pp. 382-3).

[60] Cf. supra.

THE PRIESTLY ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN PARENTHOOD

In the Christian home parents are in a certain sense priests. This is a fact altogether too little known and appreciated by Catholics today. It is an unfortunate fact because the priestly aspects of Christian parenthood can do so much to lend dignity to both Christian marriage and parenthood. It is particularly unfortunate today, when it could do much to prevent the delinquency that is so characteristic of young folks. Basic in that delinquency is disrespect for authority, and for those who represent authority, notably parents. A genuine appreciation of the priestly aspects of Christian parenthood on the part of youth would do much to counteract that disrespect

When one considers the purposes of parenthood and of the family, it can hardly cause surprise that God has honored parents with special priestly prerogatives. The primary purpose is the welfare of the child. And we must never forget the dignity of the child—who he is, what he is born for, what he is trained for. The child is the highest of all God's visible creatures. In fact, he is just a little less than God's invisible creation. As we read in Holy Writ (*Psalm* 13: 16), he is, as is the case with all human beings, "a little less than the angels." He is a being created according to the very image and likeness of God. And what is he born for? What does he come upon this earth for? Most assuredly not to become a dishonorable delinquent. To the contrary, he is born to live most honorably in accordance with the high station that is his as a child of God. He is born to be a member of God's Church on earth. He is born, as the encyclical on Christian marriage so beautifully puts it, to be "a fellow citizen of the saints." He is born eventually to dwell in the eternal mansions of his heavenly Father.

It is the parents who are primarily to prepare the child for all that. Hence it is no wonder that Christian parenthood has been highly dignified by God. It cannot surprise us that fathers and mothers have been given priestly prerogatives in the Catholic home.

On what basis can we say that parents are priests in the Christian home? What proofs can be offered for such a contention? There is the fact, for instance, that parents administer the sacrament of matrimony. The priest is not the minister of that sacrament. The contracting parties administer it. But to administer a sacrament is to confer grace, and surely that is a priestly function. Hence at the very beginning of their married life the Christian husband and wife exercise a priestly function. They administer a sacrament; they confer grace upon each other.

That a father, specifically, has a priestly office in the home, is beautifully shown by St. Augustine, who was bishop of Hippo, in Africa, in the early years of Christianity. The bishop was preaching one day to a group of fathers of families of his diocese. In addressing himself to them he did not say, as might a bishop or priest today, "My dear Christian friends" or "My dear Christian people." No, he addressed them with this striking salutation, "My dear fellow bishops." Then the saint went on to say to them: "Each and every one of you (fathers) have in the home the bishop's office, to see to it that neither his wife, nor his son, nor his daughter, nor even his servant, fall away from truth. For they are bought with a great price."

There is hardly any mistaking the obvious meaning of those words. They mean that, much as a bishop is accountable before God for his diocesan flock, so is the father of a family accountable for the spiritual welfare of his little sheepfold, his family. He has priestly duties to perform towards its members. To repeat St. Augustine's words to the fathers: "Each and every one of you have in the home the bishop's office, to see to it that neither his wife nor his son nor his daughter, nor even his servant fall away from faith. For they are bought with a great price." But what is a bishop's office if not preeminently one of the care or guardianship of souls, a priestly office?

There are also scriptural bases for the truth that Christian fathers, and also Christian mothers, are priests in the home. For instance, there are the well-known words of Holy Writ that tell us that Christian marriage is a symbol of the union of Christ with His Spouse the Church. That fact is plainly stated by St. Paul in the Fifth Chapter of his Epistle to the Ephesians. Then, immediately following it, the great apostle goes on to say: "'Let wives be subject to their husbands as to the Lord." And he gives the reason. "Because," he says, "the husband is head of the wife as Christ is head of the Church." And what does he say of husbands? "Husbands love your wives as Christ loved the Church and delivered Himself up for her that he might sanctify her."

What those words really imply is this: The Christian family, which is based on Christian marriage, is a miniature copy of the Church of God. It is the Church in small form. If one visualizes it as such, he will see the father representing Christ as its head, much as the Holy Father represents Christ at the head of God's great family, the Church. Furthermore, he will see the mother representing the body or the Church itself. Finally, he will see the children, who are members of the body, representing the faithful of the Church.

If one really grasps the full meaning of that, he will see in it the most remarkable teaching, the highest idealism. It indicates, for instance, the high plane on which St. Paul puts the relationships of the family members. The husband, he says, is to love the wife as Christ loved the Church. If that is the case, then the wife, in turn, is to love the husband as the Church loves Christ. By the same token one must conclude that the children must have for father and mother in the Catholic home something of that reverence and love and respect that they have for Christ and the Church. For, in that little Church, the Christian home, the father and mother represent, respectively, Christ and the Church. If that teaching is really grasped and fully lived, what a tremendous influence would it not have on the members of the family. One could hardly imagine any delinquency in such a home.

As was noted in the foregoing, the father represents Christ as the head of the home. To appreciate in any full measure what that implies, it is necessary to see what the role of Christ Himself was, and what His powers were in that role or office. Here we come face to face with the fact that Christ was a Priest. He was sent by the Father to have the care or guardianship of souls. In fact, he was the great and unique High Priest, the Pastor and Pontiff Supreme. Hence one must conclude that if the father represents Christ in the home he must in some measure be a priest. As to Christ's power in His priestly role, He Himself tells us that He had the fullness of power. "All power is given me," he says, "in heaven and on earth." Before ascending into heaven He gave that power to His followers. He gave it in varying degrees. As St. Paul said: He made some pastors, some apostles. And he used still other terms.

To whom, precisely, and in what measure did He give His priestly powers? What powers, specifically, did He give to parents?

At the head of the list we, of course, find the Holy Father, the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ had made His Vicar on earth. In his capacity as Supreme Pastor, we know that he has powers that no one else has. And how fittingly he is called the Holy Father. He is the father, that is the head of Christ's great family on earth, the Church.

Then there are under this supreme pastor lesser pastors placed over specific portions of Christ's flock, and in their respective positions or offices given varying amounts of Christ's power or authority. Here we have the bishops in their dioceses and the priests in their parishes. Both are priests in holy orders. Both have been consecrated through that sacrament to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, to administer the sacraments generally, and to teach in an official capacity for the Church. Both are priests in the fuller sense of the term. We say in the language of theology that the bishop has the fullness of the priesthood. The priest has it in somewhat lesser measure. The bishop confers the sacrament of holy orders, not the priest. So too is it ordinarily the bishop and not the priest who confirms.

But more directly to the point here is the fact that there is also a priesthood of the faithful or of the laity. This includes all the faithful. St. Peter refers to all the faithful as the "royal priesthood." They have all been consecrated through the sacrament of baptism and normally, in time, also through the sacrament of confirmation. To be sure, the consecration given through these two sacraments does not empower them to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass, to administer the sacraments generally, or to teach in an official capacity for the Church. Those powers are only given through the sacrament of holy orders. But it does make them members of "the royal priesthood," to use the words that St. Peter applies to them. In other words, it does give them certain priestly functions to perform. It is for them, for instance, to defend the interests of Christ in the home and in public. It is also for them to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass with the priest, though, of course, they cannot consecrate as can the ordained priest.

A further distinction may well be made here. It is one that relates particularly to our subject of the priesthood of parenthood.

Among all the members of the priesthood of the faithful, there are some who have not only been consecrated through the sacraments of baptism and confirmation, as have the members of the laity generally, but, in addition, through still another sacrament—not holy orders, as is the case with the ordained priest, but *matrimony,* a sacrament which consecrates the two who receive it to a new and joint office in the church, an office they did not have before marriage, although they ranked even then as members of the lay priesthood. Reference is of course made to husbands and wives, to fathers and mothers. They have, by virtue of Christian marriage, certain priestly roles they did not have before marriage. What, specifically, are these pastoral functions or roles of these lay priests, the fathers and mothers of Catholic families?

The late Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, very clearly pointed to one of them in our day, in a great world letter he wrote on the Church, that is, in his encyclical on the *Mystical Body of Christ.* Therein he notes that matrimony implies a solemn consecration of the married partners to a joint and sacred teaching office in the Church. His words run as follows: "Through matrimony, in which the contracting parties are ministers of grace to one another, provision is made for the external and duly regulated increase of the Christian society, and what is of greater importance, for the correct religious instruction of children without which the Mystical Body of Christ would be in grave danger." Those words clearly indicate one of the main priestly offices or functions of parents, namely, the teaching of religion to their children. The two of them are the children's first teachers. And of the utmost importance in connection with that office is the teaching of religion, since the very purpose and end for which the child comes into this world is, through the knowledge and practice of his religion one day to return to God for an eternity of happiness with Him. Hence it is for the parents to teach their children religious truths in accordance with their ability to learn and understand them. They must teach them the life and truths of Christ. They must teach them the laws of God.

That is a high and noble task indeed. It implies a joint office on the part of the father and mother of safeguarding, through its medium, the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church. Little wonder, then, that it has been said that, for parents to fulfill that teaching office toward their children, is to participate in the lay priesthood in its most glorious form. The very safety of the Church, as the Holy Father pointed out in his encyclical, depends in a measure on it.

Although this teaching office is a joint office on the part of the father and mother, a special word should be said here regarding the mother. She undoubtedly plays a ranking part in this important office of the priesthood of the faithful. Her knee, it might well be said, is logically the child's first pulpit. Her nearness to him, her maternal love for him on the one hand, and the child's limitless confidence in her on the other, place her in a commanding position in regard to this task.

As to what, specifically, the mother should teach the child, the following items might well be indicated at this point. First of all, she should teach the highly important fact already adverted to regarding the father, namely, that he represents Christ at the head of the home. Deeply should she impress that truth on the mind of her children. Then, too, should she carefully instil into their minds the fact that the father has great dignity and therefore merits high regard, because, as Holy Writ tells us, his fatherhood, like all fatherhood, is of God. Again, she should teach them that the authority which the father exercises in the home is a reflection of the authority of God. So, too, should she give the child to understand, as best that can be done, that she, as mother in the home, is an image of Holy Mother Church. Needless to add, this last fact also demands high regard and profound respect for her on the part of the child.

To be sure, both father and mother will have to live their part. It can not be said, of course, that that is easy. But it can be correctly said that it is rightly expected of them. It is God's plan. Hence we are not dealing with a bit of poetic idealism, but instead, with a fact, a truth of Christianity. It is Christian teaching that father and mother, respectively, represent Christ and the Church in the Catholic home. Where such high ideals of the Christian family are brought to the attention of the children from their earliest years, the children will present few serious problems to their parents. They will have the high regard and respect for their parents that they should have. They will also carry their respect out into the wider reaches of society. They will not be numbered among our scandalous juvenile delinquents.

With regard to the general field of religious truth that parents, as priests in the home, should teach their little ones, it should be well to emphasize that teaching by example is a matter of very great importance. Children are great imitators. It is a truism to say that they learn readily and well through example, through imitation, through participation. To be sure, to place emphasis on religious *example* in the home is not to maintain that verbal instruction, learning by rote, and even preachment have no place. They do have. But example is of greater importance. And it should go without saying that, verbally to teach religious truths and practices to a child, and then to neglect them in practice, or even to go counter to them in the home, would be to leave much to be desired in his religious upbringing. It is the actual living of the faith by the father, who comes to represent Christ in the mind of the child, and by the mother, who represents Holy Mother Church, that is the key to success in the highly important task of teaching the child his religion.

In connection with the matter of teaching religion by example in the home, it is well to note that traditionally the Catholic home was characterized by a great variety of religious practices and rituals. In fact, in the early Christian centuries that was so much the case that the home was called a Church in miniature. Thus, St. John Chrysostom, living in the early Christian centuries and writing in the Greek language, referred to the home as an *ecclesiola,* a term that means a small church. St. Benedict, who lived but a short time later, applied much the same term to the monastic home of his religious family. He called it a house of god, that is to say, a church.

But, unfortunately, many of the religious devotions and ritualistic practices that were found in the Catholic homes of past centuries have been neglected or even totally lost in our day. And, although most of them were very simple, altogether suited to children, one of the greatest things that could be done to the Catholic family in our day would be to restore them. They would do much to make the home again a little church. They would provide the parents much opportunity to serve as priests in the home. They would help them very much in fulfilling, through the medium of example and actual participation, their fundamental priestly office of teaching religion to their children.

There are a variety of ways in which this could be done today, as it was also done in the past. Certainly important are the following ones: (1) Restoring the sacramentals to the home; (2) cultivating religious expressions in the family circle; (3) celebrating religious anniversaries or milestones on the family hearth; (4) adapting the religious life of the family to the liturgical year, that is, to the feasts and seasons of the church year.

A practice that might serve as an example of the last of these is that still observed by some of the Austrian people of having a symbolic Last Supper in the home on the evening of the feast of Holy Thursday. The family members all come to the table dressed in their Sunday best. Special buns will have been prepared and placed, together with little canters of wine at the father's place at the head of the table. The father takes one of the buns, breaks it and gives it, together with a cup of wine, to the mother. Then he does the same for the oldest child. The rest are similarly served. Finally all seat themselves and reverently consume the bread and wine in remembrance of the Last Supper while the father reads the Gospel describing that event. The main dish of the meal that follows is a specially prepared Easter lamb. It is carved and served by the father, who represents Christ who presided over the Last Supper in the Cenacle.

A similar custom is found among the Slovak people. It is observed on Christmas eve and is known as the *oblatky*. During the week preceding Christmas, small, oval-shaped wafers will have been baked in the parish and blessed by the pastor. These are then sent to the homes of the parishioners, one for every member of every family. Before the evening meal, which will have been prepared according to a special menu, the father takes one of the wafers, puts a bit of honey on it to signify the goodness of God, and gives it to the mother. Then the children are served in the order of their age, beginning with the oldest. When all have been served, they seat themselves and consume the wafer in remembrance of the Bread that came down from heaven, while the father reads the Gospel of the first Christmas Mass.

Just to mention one more practice, that of the parental blessing. This practice existed not only in Christian families down through the centuries but was even found under the Old Law. It consists of parents blessing their little ones in the home. This may be done, for instance, just after the birth of a child, or whenever the child retires in the evening, or when he goes out into the dangers of the street, or when he goes on a journey or returns from it. It is a practice that strikingly enables parents to fulfill their office of priests in that little church, the home. It lends great dignity to the parental office and cultivates respect and regard on the part of children for the father and mother. While these and similar practices may seem inconsequential to grown-ups, they are not so when considered from the viewpoint of the child. They are very important because of the fruits that they bear in his case.

But teaching is not the only priestly function of parents in the home. They must also be mediators for the child with God. That is to say, they must pray for the child. They must intercede for him with God. Much as the priest stands as mediator between the faithful and God, so must the parents stand as mediators between their children and God. It is an important priestly duty. How important it is we see from the example of Saints Augustine and Monica. We learn from the lives of these two great saints that in his younger years St. Augustine was far from a paragon of virtue. His father was not a Christian. There was not the example that might well be expected of him. But the mother, St. Monica, was an exemplary Christian woman. In season and out of season she prayed for her wayward son, and with the result that he not only returned to the path of virtue, but eventually became a great bishop and a great saint. That was the result of the intercessory prayers of a saintly mother. And so we may be certain that millions of other children have been kept to the path of virtue, or have been brought back from their delinquent ways, by the intercessory prayers of devout and devoted parents. Yes, it is an important priestly function of parents to intercede for their children.

Beside the priestly parental functions of teacher and mediator, there is a third that must not be overlooked. It is that of sanctifier. This, too, was typified in Christ the Priest. What is to be said of it insofar as parents are concerned? Does it also come within the scope of their priestly office? In other words, can they sanctify their children? In general the answer is in the affirmative. But certain reservations must be made. Thus, fathers and mothers cannot transmit supernatural life to their children. However, they have the obligation of seeing to it that supernatural life is transmitted to them. That is, they have the obligation of bringing their children to Christ, in the person of the priest, in order that through baptism the spiritual life of the soul may be transmitted to them, that thereby they may be made children of God and heirs to His Kingdom. Then, too, after they have been made children of God, they can help them on in the work of saving their souls. That follows logically from the fact that the two spouses live constantly after their marriage, in a sacramental state, and, as a result, have a continuing title to the graces of the sacrament, both for themselves and for the children that have been entrusted to their spiritual care.

To be sure, all this does not happen automatically. Parents must make themselves truly worthy of their priestly duties. That is, they must be characterized by genuine personal holiness. They must strive to show themselves true representatives of Christ and of the Church in the home. It is safe to say that with each additional degree of union of parents' soul with God, with each additional step they take on the path of virtue, the more powerful will they be with God, the more influential will they be in supernatural action over the souls of their children. The holier the parents, the more fruitful their prayers for their children. That is all really to say that parents must not only be holy because of themselves, but also because of their children. It is to say that they must not only procure the glory of God through their own personal perfection, but they must also procure it through the spiritual fruitfulness of the souls of the children committed to their care.

Most honorable, then, is Christian parenthood. It is truly a priestly office. If Christian husbands and wives really lived in the homes of our day the honor positions that are theirs, how speedily would the ominous pall of secularism that hangs over so many homes be lifted, and how surely would the dark and foreboding cloud of delinquency be dispelled. How much more secure, too, could parents feel that they were fulfilling the sublime task that has been given them by the Almighty, the preparing of their little ones for eventual eternal union with Him in heaven.

EDGAR SCHMIEDLER, O.S.B.

Ursuline Academy
Paola, Kansas

THE NEW TESTAMENT DESIGNATION OF THE TRUE CHURCH AS GOD'S TEMPLE

The basic function of the theological treatise *de ecclesia Christi* is that of explaining the meaning of the term "the true Church of Jesus Christ" as it stands in the sentence "The Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ." This should be quite evident. All that the *scientia divina* has to say about the divine foundation of the Church, about its marks, its qualities, its powers, and its relations with other societies, can have but little meaning for the individual who is not equipped with at least a relatively adequate and entirely accurate grasp of what God has revealed about the inmost nature of His Church. A deficient concept of the fundamental truths about the Church must inevitably vitiate any or all of the other teachings set forth in the theological *tractatus de ecclesia.*

Traditionally one of the most effective methods for gathering together and proposing what divine public revelation has to say about the intimate constitution of the Church has involved the use of the various names or designations applied to the Church and to its members throughout the inspired books of the New Testament. Each one of these names or figures brings out into effectively clear relief some section of the truth that God has revealed about the nature of the Church.[1] One of the most interesting and meaningful of all these designations is the expression "temple of God" or "temple of the Holy Ghost" which St. Paul employed as a metaphorical name for the Catholic Church.

Underlying this title are lessons about the Church which are urgently needed in our times. These lessons can only be understood when the meaning involved in the metaphorical name is set forth clearly in proper or non-metaphorical terminology. Both the meditation and the preaching of our priests should profit considerably from a theological consideration of those lessons.

To appreciate this teaching, we should consider carefully three passages from the epistles of St. Paul in which the Apostle of the Gentiles designates the members of the Church as constituting God's temple. We shall consider first the lessons or teachings set forth explicitly in these passages, and then the implications of the metaphorical designation "temple of God" as it is used to designate the Church, the *congregatio fidelium.*

---

[1] Cf. Fenton, "New Testament Designations of the Catholic Church and of Its Members," in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* IX, 1, 2 (Jan., April, 1947), 127-46; 275-306.

St. Paul applies the metaphor "God's temple" to the collectivity of his readers, the members of the true Church of Jesus Christ, in both of his epistles to the Corinthians and in his letter to the Ephesians. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians he writes:

> Know you not that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?
>
> But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which you are.[2]

In this passage we find three assertions about the Church which are proposed as God's truth and as pertinent to that aspect of revealed teaching about the Church which is brought out in the use of the metaphorical name "temple of God" as a designation or title of the Church. They are:

(1) The Holy Ghost dwells within the company of the faithful, which is the Catholic Church.

(2) The Church, considered as knowable under the metaphor "temple of God," has a special holiness.

(3) The man who violates the Church is committing a most grievous offense against God and will be severely punished by God.

It is obvious that the first of these truths is the key aspect of the Church which is emphasized by the use of the term "God's temple" as a metaphorical name or designation of the Church. This truth must be understood if we are to have anything like an adequate concept of the true dignity God has given to the company of His Son's disciples. And it can only be understood when the truth, set forth in metaphorical or figurative language in this inspired document, is expressed in proper or non-metaphorical terminology. Actually the non-figurative statement and explanation of this truth is readily available to us in the traditional literature of sacred theology.

THE DIVINE INDWELLING IN THE CHURCH

St. Paul states that God, or the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, dwells in the people who constitute the membership of the

---

[2] *I Cor.,* 3: 16 f.

Catholic Church in something like the way in which He dwells in His temple. This key teaching about the Church very obviously has reference to some special and supernatural way in which God may rightly be said to live or dwell within the Catholic Church as He does in no other association of human beings. Or, to put the same thing in another way, St. Paul's terminology indicates very clearly that the Triune God is present in or to the true Church of Jesus Christ in a way in which He is not present in or to any other social unit. This indwelling in a social unit or organization is something within the order of the intrinsically or the essentially supernatural. It is within the order of grace, rather than of nature.

Now the supernatural indwelling of God within His creatures can only be explained in the light of what is true about God's being in all things. Of course it must first be understood that God is not in any creature in any way as a body is said to be within its container. The only way in which God can be said to be within anything, in either the natural or the supernatural order, is in the way a spirit can be said to be in something or present to it.

In the *Summa theologica* St. Thomas Aquinas very effectively reminds us of the fact that God is within all things naturally in three distinct ways.[3] He is said to be in all things by His substance because all things distinct from Himself are being continuously held in existence and act by Him. No being distinct from God could exist or operate for the tiniest moment unless it were being conserved in being and in act by God.

God is in all created or contingent realities by His power, in the sense that all these things are completely subject to Him and to His will. There is no creature upon which the Creator cannot act directly and immediately.

Finally, God is said to be within all things by His presence. All created reality is understood directly and immediately and comprehensively by God.

We must not lose sight of the fact that God is *naturally* within all created things or present to them in these three ways. It would be absolutely impossible to have any creature exempted from its complete and basic dependence upon God for being and for operation, to have any creature not completely and immediately subject to God's power, or to have any creature not fully and directly and comprehensively understood and known by God. The manner of indwelling according to which the Triune God is present within the Church and in function of which the Church is designated as His temple is something quite apart from this.

---

[3] Cf. *Summa theologica,* Ia, q. 8, a. 3.

There is one way, and only one way, in which God can rightly be said to be in a creature other than according to the three natural modes by which He is in all things other than Himself. Supernaturally, by a free and indescribably generous donation of Himself, God can be in intellectual creatures as the one known is in the one knowing, and as the object of love is present to the one loving.[4] This is the divine indwelling of the life of grace, the divine indwelling in terms of which the designation of the Church as the temple of the Holy Ghost must be understood. This supernatural divine indwelling is the very basis of the intrinsically supernatural order.

It must be understood, of course, that God is in an intellectual creature as the one known is in the one knowing only when He is the direct and immediate object of intellectual perception. It is completely and purely natural for intellectual beings to know about God as the First Cause and the Last End of all things apart from Himself. As a matter of fact activity along this line constitutes the natural perfection of any created intelligence.

But, in this purely natural intellectual knowledge of God, the creature, either human or angelic, is primarily and immediately aware of intelligible reality on the level of its own natural excellence. In the case of the human being, the created intelligence is directly cognizant of the intelligibility of material things. Where created pure spirits are concerned, the only reality of which they could be directly aware within the purely natural order would be the reality of their own essences. In both cases, they would ascertain that this reality obviously could not be as it is and act as it does unless it were being kept in being and in operation by a divine First Cause. And, in both cases, the thing known would be immediately and directly the created reality rather than God Himself.

Now the fundamental truth in all the economy of salvation is the fact that God has willed to offer and to give to His intellectual creatures a kind of intellectual activity and perfection in which they will be immediately and directly intellectually cognizant of Him. The Vatican Council has brought out this fact when it taught that supernatural revelation is absolutely necessary to men "because God, out of His infinite goodness, has ordered man to a supernatural end, that is, to the sharing of divine goods which completely surpass the understanding of the human mind."[5] In this way the favored intellectual creature is enabled to know God directly and immediately, and God is said to be within Him as the one known is within or present to the one knowing.

---

[4] Cf. *ibid.*

The act by which the favored intellectual creature perceives God Himself immediately and directly is the Beatific Vision. The person who enjoys the Beatific Vision understands and possesses God as God knows Himself, in the Trinity of His Persons and in the absolute Unity of His Nature. The Blessed Trinity cannot, of course, be perceived in any merely natural act of intellectual knowledge by a creature because, knowing God only as the First Cause, the creature would be able to apprehend only the One Divine Nature which is the principle of all God's activity with reference to contingent beings. Directly perceiving the created reality on its own entitative level, the creature in its natural act of understanding would know that this contingent reality necessarily depends in its existence and in its operation on the causality of one First Cause. But, by the power of God's intrinsically supernatural aid or grace, the favored creature who understands God directly and immediately is aware of Him as the Triune God.

Now it should be quite manifest that God is in the creature who possesses the Beatific Vision as the one known is in the one knowing. And, by the same token, God is said to be in this way within every intellectual creature who possesses the life to which the Beatific Vision belongs. The life to which the Beatific Vision belongs, and of which it is the final and perfective expression, is the essentially supernatural life of sanctifying grace. Ultimately, then, the only way in which God is within or present to a creature in a supernatural way, in a manner distinct from and superior to the fashion in which He is naturally within or present to all things created, is according to the life of sanctifying grace.

It is essential that we should realize that the life of sanctifying grace, motivated by the supernatural affection of divine charity, has a corporate as well as an individual expression. There are individual men and women who live the life of sanctifying grace and who direct their activities in accordance with the intention of charity. God dwells supernaturally in each of these men and women. But there is also a company of men and women, a social unit, which lives by the dictates of divine and supernatural charity. This community is the one and only vehicle in which the life of sanctifying grace is lived on a corporate level. By reason of this fact God is said to be within or present to this one community in a special and supernatural way. That social unit or institution is the Catholic Church. By reason of the unique and supernatural divine indwelling within it, that community has been rightly and significantly designated as God's temple.

---

[5] *Denz.*, 1786.

Briefly, that is the primary lesson brought out in St. Paul's employment of the metaphor "temple of God" as a designation of the true Church, the Catholic Church.

THE HOLINESS OF THE TEMPLE

Sanctity or holiness consists in a firm and unwavering attachment to God and a complete aversion from all moral evil. It is preeminently a characteristic of the true Church precisely because of the special, unique, and supernatural indwelling of the Triune God within this society. It is a quality of the Church, considered precisely as the temple of God, brought out in our passage from the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the Church is a holy society by reason of the fact that, alone among the social units or institutions existing among the children of men, it lives a corporate life dominated and motivated by supernatural charity, the love of God known in the Trinity of His Persons and in the absolute Unity of His Nature, along with the love of intellectual creatures demanded or required by this supernatural love for God. In other words, the Church in intrinsically holy precisely because it is the social unit which acts as the corporate vehicle of the supernatural life of sanctifying grace. Now the special and supernatural divine indwelling in the intellectual creature in the state of grace is the cause of that state of grace, and of the creature's charity, and consequently of the creature's holiness. In the same way, the divine supernatural indwelling within the Church, the factor by reason of which the Church can rightly be designated as God's temple, is the source of the life of grace, the charity, and the holiness, of the Church.

GOD'S SPECIAL REGARD FOR THE TEMPLE

St. Paul wrote: "But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy, which you are." He indicates the fact that a special and grievous punishment is reserved by God for those who harm or try to harm the Church. And he points out the intimate connection between this aspect or part of revealed doctrine about the Church, and the teaching about the Church's holiness.

In order to understand this teaching, we must take cognizance of the fact that when St. Paul applied the name "temple of God" to the society of Our Lord's disciples, he was referring to the temple of Jerusalem. He was saying that the relation of the true Church of the New Testament to the Triune God is somewhat similar to the relation of the temple of Jerusalem, under the old dispensation, to God. Obviously the most important point of this comparison was to be found in the fact that, just as God was present in a special and supernatural way uniquely in the temple of Jerusalem under the period of the dispensation that ended with the death of Our Lord upon the Cross, God dwells in a special and supernatural way uniquely within the social unit known as the Catholic Church. Like the temple of old, the true Church of Jesus Christ is holy primarily by reason of the fact that God dwells within it in a special, supernatural, and unique way.

The divine presence in the temple of Jerusalem was basically along the line of that religion which is an integral and essentially necessary part of the supernatural life of sanctifying grace. The temple was, from the time of its inception, the only place within which the sacrifices of Israel, the sacrifices authorized and commanded by God Himself within the framework of the old dispensation, could legitimately be offered. God deigned to accede to Solomon's prayer that the petitions offered to God by the people of Israel would be answered with special and singular efficacy when those prayers were offered within the confines of that temple.[6]

Prayer and sacrifice are essentially acts of worship or religion. They are among those acts by which man tends to pay to God the debt of acknowledgment and gratitude which is strictly due to God by reason of His supreme and sovereign excellence, and because of our absolute dependence upon Him. The acts of worship or religion are the most sacred and meaningful of all the acts man is capable of performing. The place consecrated to these acts was in a special way dear to God and armed with His protection, in such a way that any man who profaned this building laid himself open to the most severe punishment by God.

---

[6] Cf. *III Kings,* c. 8.

The society of the disciples of Jesus Christ, which was organized and formed around Himself by Our Lord during the course of His public life on earth, and which became the one and only supernatural kingdom on earth at the moment of Our Lord's salvific death upon the Cross, is likewise something directly and immediately consecrated to the worship of the living God. The sacrifice of the Mass, which is the continuation and as it were the application of the unique sacrifice of the Cross, is actually something which is meant to be offered within the confines of this society, and only within those confines. It is really the essential act of this society. Any offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice outside of the confines of this community constitutes a profanation of the sacrifice itself. And the prayer which Our Lord commanded His disciples to offer enters into the very fabric of the formula within which the Eucharistic sacrifice, the Act of the Mystical Body, is effected.

Thus the Church itself can rightly be considered as a reality within which God dwells supernaturally and uniquely as the object of the only authorized worship. Since it is in a special way consecrated to the work of religion, it is in a very definite way holy and dedicated to God. The misuse of the Church and the profanation of its functions and its doctrines constitute offenses which God will certainly punish most severely.

* * * * *

The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians contains a long passage in which the members of the true Church are designated by the metaphorical name "temple of the living God."

> Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness?
>
> And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?
>
> And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God; as God saith: I will dwell in them and walk among them. And I will be their God: and they shall be my people.

> And I will receive you. And I will be a Father to you: and you shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.[7]

In this text St. Paul urges the members of the Church to refrain from marrying those outside of this society. He stresses his appeal by bringing out the special dignity of the Church as God's temple, and the contrast and opposition between the Church and the world. In the course of his teaching he brings out these aspects of the Church considered as God's temple.

(1) There is a definite and fundamental opposition between the Church and the association of those who do not belong to it.

(2) The one supernatural covenant of God with men according to the dispensation of the New Testament is God's agreement with the Catholic Church. The members of the true Church of the New Testament are the people of the covenant, God's chosen people, the true Israel of the new law.

(3) By reason of the old covenant, the people of the old temple of Jerusalem were in a special way the children of God. So, by reason of the new covenant, the people of the Catholic Church are God's adopted sons and daughters.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD: LIGHT AND DARKNESS

In pressing his point that members of the Church should not marry those outside of this society, St. Paul brought out with matchless clarity that doctrine which, as a part of Catholic teaching, was set down emphatically and effectively by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Humanum genus*.

> The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their heart to be united with it so as to gain salvation must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and control are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who

---

[7] *II Cor.*, 6: 14-18.

have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching even to contempt of self, a heavenly one. At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardor and assault.[8]

St. Paul gives us a tremendously valuable lesson when he shows us that the Church, considered as constituting God's one and only supernatural kingdom in this world and as unalterably opposed to the kingdom of Satan, is rightly designated under the metaphor of God's temple. The temple was uniquely dedicated to the service and the cult of the living God. Any profanation of the temple was a most serious sacrilege. And, in like manner, the Catholic Church is the one social unit which, as God's supernatural kingdom according to the new dispensation, is completely and uniquely consecrated to God's worship. It is wrong to associate with the Church or with any of its parts any factors foreign or hostile to the service of God.

THE TEMPLE AND THE COVENANT

Essentially the divine covenant is an agreement which God enters into with the people which, in His mercy, He chooses as, in a special way, His own. By the terms of that pact, God freely accepts this people as belonging to Him in a special and supernatural way. He promises to protect them, and He consecrates them to His service.

On the other hand, the people of the covenant agree to devote themselves in a special way to the service and acknowledgement of God according to the rites He Himself has chosen. They promise to worship God, and to bring nothing into their lives which would militate against their acceptance of Him and their praise of Him as the one and only Creator of the world. They will take no false gods to themselves.

---

[8] This passage is found in Father Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 83.

In the economy of the old covenant, the temple of Jerusalem was in a special way the center and the abode of that covenant. The sacrifices authorized and commanded by God were to be offered in the temple alone. Furthermore, the ark of the original Mosaic covenant was enclosed within this building, and the temple itself was the recipient of God's special promises, protection, and blessings. The temple was the place where the true God was present in a unique and intrinsically supernatural way, in a manner connected with the divine indwelling according to the life of sanctifying grace.

The Catholic Church, as the true Israel of the New Testament, is characterized by the authentic priesthood which is inseparably joined to any covenant between God and His chosen people. Ultimately and basically that priesthood is inherent in Our Lord. The people of the Church, taken as a whole, constitute what St. Peter called a "holy priesthood" and a "royal priesthood,"[9] by which and in which the eternal sacrifice of the Redeemer is continued. In a more special way, the ordained priests of the Catholic Church offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the instruments of Christ Himself.

ADOPTIVE DIVINE SONSHIP WITHIN THE CHURCH

It was characteristic of the Mosaic dispensation that the members of God's chosen people should be designated in the Scriptures as His children. Deuteronomy exhorts the people of the ancient covenant to be and to act as "children of the Lord your God."[10] The prophecy of Malachias reproaches the people of Israel for having refused to honor God as their Father: "If then I be a father, where is my honor?"[11]

What was set forth in a comparatively shadowy way in the Old Testament was brought out with magnificent clarity in the New. Our Lord taught and commanded the original members of the society of His disciples to pray to God addressing Him as Our Father. The Epistle to the Romans tells us that "the Spirit himself giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God."[12] And the First Epistle of St. John again brings out this same paramount truth.

---

[9] Cf. *I Pet.*, 2: 5, 9.

[10] Cf. *Deut.*, 14: 1.

[11] Cf. *Mal.*, 1: 6.

[12] *Rom.*, 8: 16.

> Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called and should be the sons of God. Therefore the world knoweth not us, because it knew not him.
>
> Dearly beloved, we are now the sons of God: and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that when he shall appear we shall be like to him: because we shall see him as he is.[13]

The Catholic Church can rightly be designated by the metaphorical name of God's temple principally and primarily by reason of the divine indwelling within that Church. In the passage from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul brings out the fact that the same factor which renders the Church knowable as God's temple makes the loyal and faithful members of the Church truly God's adopted children.

* * * * *

There is a special wealth of significance in the passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians wherein the members of the true Church of Jesus Christ are designated as the temple.

> Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners: but you are fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God.
>
> Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone:
>
> In whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord.
>
> In whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit.[14]

Apart from the lessons contained in the context of the passages in the Epistles to the Corinthians in which the Church is designated as God's temple, this citation from St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians contains two distinct teachings.

(1) The members of the Church may be said metaphorically to constitute God's temple by reason of the fact that they co-operate in different ways to compose a reality within which God dwells, acting in somewhat the same way that the stones which made up

---

[13] *I John,* 3: 1 f.

[14] *Eph.,* 2: 19-22.

the temple of Jerusalem co-operated, each in its own fashion, to make up an edifice within which God is present in a special and supernatural way.

(2) The Church is expected to increase in perfection, in somewhat the same way that the temple grew or was built up during the time of its construction.

Both lessons are brought out together in one of the most beautiful prayers in all the Roman liturgy, the postcommunion of the Mass for the dedication of a church.

> O God, who, from living and chosen stones, art preparing an eternal dwelling place for Thy glory, give aid to Thy people who beseech Thee that what is advantageous to Thy Church in the way of bodily dimensions may be increased by spiritual growth.

CO-OPERATION IN THE WORK OF CHRIST

The citation from the Epistle to the Ephesians insists upon the intimacy of the association of members of the Church, with Our Lord and among one another. They are the fellow-citizens of the Saints, members with them of God's one and only *ecclesia*. They are the domestics of God, commissioned and ordered to a task which is ultimately and essentially the work of God Himself. They are built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets in that their association with God and with each other is based upon their professed acceptance of the divine message which has come to us through the prophets and the apostles of Jesus Christ.

Our Lord Himself is depicted as the chief corner stone of the edifice constituted by His faithful. The *congregatio fidelium* centers around Him and completely depends upon Him. Here the designation of the Church as God's holy temple brings out much the same body of truth about the Church which is set forth under the Church's title as the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. This, together with the teaching about growth in the Church towards Christ, is brought out in another passage of the letter to the Ephesians.

> And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors:
>
> For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

> Until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ:
>
> That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive.
>
> But doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ:
>
> From whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity.[15]

St. Paul employs the metaphor "temple of God," as he uses the metaphor "body of Christ," as a name or designation of the true Church. In both instances he works to bring out the fact that all of the faithful work together for the accomplishment of one ultimate task, the attainment of God's glory in the society of His Son's disciples. Each of the members makes some special contribution to the over-all effect, just as each stone contributes to the glory of the temple, and each organ or part to the well-being of the human body.

It is the business of the members of the apostolic college, and of those whom they invite to aid them in their salvific work, and ultimately of all the members of the Church, to co-operate in the attainment of the Church's ultimate end. St. Paul makes it perfectly clear that this process of edifying or building up is directed towards the perfectioning of the corporate reality which can be compared with God's temple. It is a social unit within which God dwells, in line with the supernatural divine indwelling of the life of grace. It is the social unit within which God's truth is to be taught, and is actually taught, in all of its purity and integrity. It is the social unit within which the one and only authorized worship of God, in prayer, and in sacrifice, and in the other acts of religion, is to be accomplished. And in each of these ways, the Church is revealed as something which can be known and visualized under the figure of God's temple.

The temple was the center of the life of the faithful member of God's supernatural kingdom on earth prior to the death of Jesus

---

[15] *Eph.*, 4:11:16.

Christ. The Church, which embodies in itself the characteristics which enabled the Apostle of the Gentiles to speak of it as God's temple, must likewise be the object of the affection and loyalty of the member of the *ecclesia* of the New Testament.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in the February, 1909, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* contributed by Dr. W. Turner of the Catholic University of America, is entitled "Scholasticism versus Modernism." It is a review of ***Scholasticism, Old and New,*** by Professor M. de Wulf, of Louvain. Dr. Turner essays to answer the question "What is Scholasticism?" and defines it as "the theology and philosophy which flourished in the Christian schools of Europe during the centuries extending from the ninth to the fifteenth." He asserts that "the objection of the Modernists to Scholasticism is that the schoolmen rely too much on reason and not enough on the non-rational as sources of knowledge." . . . An article by Fr. E. Dahmus, entitled "An Evil in Our Educational Method," points out the failure of American schools to give proper training to backward children. Fr. Dahmus praises the efforts being made to remedy this defect by Mr. John Kennedy, school superintendent of Batavia, N. Y. . . . Dr. John A. Ryan discusses "The Moral Aspect of Stockwatering." He takes exception to an article contributed previously to *The American Ecclesiastical Review* by Fr. T. Slater, S.J., on this same subject, and claims that this latter is too lenient. Dr. Ryan believes that stockwatering is immoral because it aims to get an unjust rate of interest on the money actually invested. . . . Another instalment of the novel *The Blindness of the Reverend Dr. Gray,* by Canon Sheehan, appears in this issue. . . . Fr. F. Brossart, of Covington, and Fr. Martin, S.J., engage in a debate in the Studies and Conferences on various points concerning Christian burial. . . . Fr. C. W. Currier defends a plan regarding funds for missionary purposes according to which there would be a central organization for the entire country which would receive and disburse such funds. . . . This issue also contains a letter from Cardinal Merry del Val to one of the American bishops expressly stating that the Holy Father wishes the decree of the Congregation of Rites forbidding women to sing in church choirs to be faithfully observed.

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

ORNAMENTATION OF CHASUBLE

Question: Is it necessary to have a cross of some kind on a chasuble, or is a plain vestment of proper liturgical color sufficient?

Answer: Although a cross may be called the traditional ornamentation for a chasuble, it is not required. As a matter of fact, it seems that the form of a cross on a chasuble developed unintentionally out of the banding which was used to give the vestment firmness and also to hide the seams. Originally there were merely two vertical columns, one in front and one on the back. When strengthening bandings were added to form a "Y," the figure was interpreted as a cross. It was a short step from this form to the "T" cross and to the more usual Latin form.

Matters Liturgical says that "the only required ornamentation of the chasuble are the bandings or orphreys on the front and back . . . A single orphrey shall adorn one side of the chasuble; it shall be in the form of a column or pillar running lengthwise down the middle. Two orphreys, the one extending the whole length and the other practically the whole width of the chasuble, shall adorn the other side; these shall be arranged in the form of a 'Y' or a 'T' or a Latin cross. The accepted practice at Rome has the cross in front; in this country it is usually placed on the back" (*no.* 128, e; 1956 edition). However, no specific legislation is cited with regard to ornamentation and, indeed, it would seem that the only legislation to which we could refer is the general law which prescribes that "the material and form of sacred furnishings must be in conformity with the liturgical laws, with ecclesiastical tradition and, in the best way possible, with the laws of sacred art" (can. 1296, 3).

We must, when dealing with chasubles, also remember the recent declaration of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, under date of Aug. 20, 1957. This declaration referred to a Response of the S.R.C. of Dec. 9, 1925, which in turn dealt with a decree or circular letter of the S.R.C., dated Aug. 21, 1863. The earlier law was that, in the making and use of vestments for the sacrifice of the Mass and sacred functions, it is not lawful, *without consulting the Apostolic See,* to depart from the accepted use of the Church in Rome and introduce another style and shape, even an old one. This legislation, strictly interpreted, obviously excluded ample vestments. The declaration of 1957 softens this prohibition by leaving to the prudent judgment of the Ordinaries the question whether this type of vestment may be used or not. Precautions are to be taken to avoid changes that would disturb the faithful or cause them to wonder.

The present status of the question therefore is that the permission of the Ordinary is necessary, in the *use* of vestments, for any departure from the accepted usage of the Church in Rome.

ADVENT ANTIPHONS

Question: While reading the Little Hours during Advent I noticed that, although my breviary gave, in the psalter, proper antiphons for the days after some Sundays in Advent, these antiphons were missing after other Sundays. What is the reason for the omission and what antiphons should I have used?

Answer: First of all, the printing of any of these antiphons in the psalter is merely a convenience; they are carried over from the Lauds of the previous Sunday. And, since the present form of our breviary antedates the suppression of the Immaculate Conception octave, it supposes that an Advent ferial office will not occur between Dec. 8th and 15th; the omission of the antiphons in the psalter is made accordingly. When you do not find the needed antiphon conveniently repeated in the psalter, take it from Lauds of the preceding Sunday. Beginning with Dec. 17th we meet a special set of antiphons.

BLESSING OF ASHES AT EVENING MASS

Question: Is there not a recent grant from the Holy See permitting the blessing of ashes more than once on Ash Wednesday? Could you please furnish details?

Answer: On Feb. 5, 1958, our late Holy Father granted to Ordinaries the faculty of permitting, in churches where there is an evening Mass with a large attendance of the faithful, the blessing of ashes before that Mass even though ashes had been blessed before the morning Mass. In this circumstance the rite of blessing will be the same both times, i.e., as in the Roman missal. The blessing may not be used as a separate rite but must be followed by Mass.

VERNACULAR PROBLEM

Question: We have had the custom of having the faithful at Mass recite, in English, at the Offertory, the prayers which are said by the priest, beginning with the prayer "Receive, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this unspotted host, etc.," and ending with "I shall wash my hands among the innocent, etc." In view of the Instruction of Sept. 3, 1958, may this custom be continued?

Answer: Paragraph 14, c of the Instruction reads: "It is strictly forbidden either for all the faithful or for a commentator to say aloud with the priest celebrant parts of the *Proper, Ordinary, and Canon of the Mass* in Latin or in a word-for-word translation, except for the parts that shall be enumerated in *no.* 31." By virtue of this paragraph the custom you have followed is outlawed. However, your parishioners may recite, in English, other prayers which express in a more general way the meaning of the Offertory prayers. A word-for-word translation brings the faithful into *direct* participation in the Mass and all direct participation demands the use of Latin. But even with the use of Latin these Offertory prayers may not be recited aloud with the celebrant, since they are not listed in *no.* 31.

John P. McCormick, S.S.

THE SALE OF CONTRACEPTIVES

Question: May a druggist under any circumstances keep in stock and sell contraceptives? There are some Catholic druggists nowadays who seem to have no hesitation in doing this, and many of them are men who go regularly to the sacraments.

Answer: It is the common—and, as far as I know, unanimous—teaching of theologians that the owner of a drugstore is guilty of grave sin if he keeps in stock and sells contraceptives. By this is meant drugs or mechanical devices which normally have no other use than the frustration of conception. There are some drugs, such as the progestational steroids (e.g., Enovid), which can be used for licit purposes, even though they can also be used for direct contraceptive purposes. These a druggist may keep and sell without any qualms of conscience to those who make no statement as to the purpose for which they will use them, on the presumption that they will employ them in accordance with the moral law. But the sale of such articles as condoms and diaphragms, which normally have no other purpose than effecting contraception, is forbidden by the law of God to the drugstore owner under pain of mortal sin. Such is the definite teaching of such approved authors as Noldin, Merkelbach, Wouters, Aertnys-Damen, Genicot-Salsmann, Davis, Pruemmer, Iorio and Regatillo-Zalba, in their treatment of sins of co-operation. Some of these authors make the qualification that if it is certain that the contraceptive device will be used for a good purpose (for example, when it is sold to a lecturer in a Catholic medical school who intends to show it to his class, while at the same time he condemns its use) the druggist can sell it. This is, of course, a reasonable exception, but it would require the keeping of only a few contraceptives in stock, and that in a place concealed from the public.

Some of the authors cited above, such as Noldin and Wouters, regard the co-operation of the druggist who keeps and sells contraceptives in respect to the sins that will be committed by those who purchase them as formal co-operation. Certainly, this would be the case if the druggist willed these sins in themselves or urged people to commit them or explained to the customers how they could practice contraception most effectively. But I do not believe that the mere keeping and selling of contraceptives by the drugstore owner is in itself formal co-operation. I regard it as material co-operation, but so proximate that no ordinary reason will justify it, because of the heinousness of the sin involved and its harm to society. Perhaps in the fantastic supposition that a customer threatened a druggist with death unless he sold him a contraceptive, the druggist could comply. But evidently this is something that seldom or never happens. I am speaking now of the sale of the articles and drugs in question to the general public. This is forbidden, even though otherwise the druggist would suffer grave temporal loss, and might even have to go out of business.

There is an added element of grave scandal in the conduct of a Catholic druggist who keeps and sells contraceptives to the general public. Both Catholics and non-Catholics know the firm stand of the Catholic Church against contraception, and when they are aware that a Catholic druggist sells contraceptives openly, their esteem for Catholics in general and for the Catholic Church is greatly lessened, and they may even be led to believe that the Church connives at contraception. The scandal is greater if the druggist is known to approach the sacraments regularly, apparently without any action being taken by Church authorities.

Lately I have been disquieted in regard to this problem of the sale of contraceptives by Catholic druggists because I have received queries from priests (who had been approached by druggists) and by druggists themselves, presenting arguments in support of the selling of contraceptives by Catholic druggists. There has been a pleading note in some letters, asking if I could not see my way to make an exception in a particular case (described as extraordinary and unique). I have even been assured that the druggist in question would take an oath never to reveal that Fr. Connell allowed him to carry contraceptives! The main argument has been that the druggist is a good Catholic and hence should keep on in his business, but cannot do so unless he sells contraceptives. Some priests apparently believe that it is possible to adduce the overworked argument that the European theologians do not understand conditions in the United States. But, despite these arguments I could not in conscience give anything but a negative reply.

The claim that if a druggist will not sell contraceptives he will have to shut down his business is certainly exaggerated. There are many good Catholic drugstore owners in our land who absolutely refuse to have anything to do with contraceptives, and who are prospering in business. There is a society of druggists with which I am acquainted, the St. James Guild of the diocese of Covington, whose members pledge themselves not to sell any contraceptives; and I have never heard that any of these gentlemen had to go out of business as a result of his conformity to God's law.

I believe that a druggist who openly sells contraceptives is a public sinner and as such could (and even *per se* should) be refused the sacraments. However, a pastor should not proceed to this extreme measure without first consulting his Bishop.

The case is somewhat different with a clerk in a drugstore. If he would find it difficult to get a good job elsewhere, he could sell contraceptives on request, according to reliable theologians. For, he is acting, not in his own name, but merely as the deputy of his employer. His co-operation, accordingly, is more remote; and those who know that he is selling these articles only because he is a clerk who wants to retain his job will not take scandal. I might extend this same leniency to the manager of a chain store, who is commanded to keep and sell contraceptives by his employers. But the owner of a store, who has the right to decide what is to be sold or not sold, cannot share in this concession. It is well to add that the subordinates just mentioned are supposed to seek other employment if there is hope that they can obtain satisfactory jobs that will not involve even remote co-operation in the sins of others.

It is to be hoped that all priests will direct druggists according to the norms just explained—norms which are not merely my personal views but are the common teaching of Catholic theologians. If it became known that even one priest assured a drugstore owner that he could keep and sell contraceptives, many druggists throughout the country would adopt the same procedure without inquiring further into the matter. For many lay persons will accept an opinion on the lenient side if they have even one priest to support them, no matter how limited may be his theological knowledge.

A PROBLEM IN ABSTINENCE

Question: If a person travelling by air goes from East to West on a Friday, thus passing from one time zone to another, may he eat meat in this second zone at 11 P.M. (when it is midnight in the former zone) on the ground that he has observed abstinence for twenty-four hours, the prescribed period for a complete day, according to Canon 21?

Answer: It is solidly probable that the traveler may eat meat after 11 P.M. in the place of his arrival because of the argument presented by the questioner. In support of this opinion we find the following statement in a doctoral dissertation from the School of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America: "If a person went from New York to Chicago he would add an hour to his day and would theoretically have to abstain through 25 hours in view of Canon 14, § 1, n. 1. In practice, however, it is reasonable to say that this person is not obliged to abstain for more than 24 hours, because he has already fulfilled the obligation of fasting through Friday which consists of 24 hours only" (Dubé, *Reckoning of Time in Canon Law* [The Catholic University of America Press, 1941], p. 181).

It should be added that a traveler in the circumstances presented would be bound to observe abstinence by divine law if by eating meat he would give scandal to those who saw him and who would not understand the canonical principle he was calling into use.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

THE CHRISTMAS MESSAGE OF HIS HOLINESS POPE JOHN XXIII*

THE JOY OF THE CHRISTIAN PEOPLE IN THE NEW POPE

(I) My Lord Cardinal, We thank you for the gracious words of affection which you have addressed to Us in the name of the entire Sacred College, the sight of the renewed youth of which today gives Us great pleasure. We are grateful also for the happy reference you have been pleased to make to the joy and expectation of the whole world, of the distinguished representatives of various nations, and of the Roman prelates, for the beginning of this new pontificate.

Nevertheless, from the knowledge, however imperfect, which We have of Ourselves, and in submission of spirit, We feel the need to declare that it is not simply owing to the human and cordial behavior of Our lowly self that there has suddenly come to be given us—as you so kindly said—the sympathy of peoples and governments, particularly marked in the outbursts of joy and respect from the people of Rome close around Us. It is rather to a renewed outpouring of the grace of the Holy Spirit which was promised to the Church of Jesus Christ, and which continues to call forth the varied manifestations of a medley of tongues that the many wonderful displays of devotion around Us evoke.

We take pleasure in recalling, My Lord Cardinal, the journey back from the Lateran to the Vatican, accompanied by yourself and Cardinal Pizzardo on November 23, exactly a month ago, after We had taken possession of Our Cathedral of St. John, along the streets of the city: that throng, assembled in such numbers, and their behavior and greetings, at once joyful, respectful and devout.

And on December 8, at the Piazza di Spagna, and afterwards at St. Mary Major—Ah! what triumphal jubilation of voice and heart, as at the linking of the two names so dear to the Romans, Mary Immaculate and the Pope!

---

* This is the translation issued by the NCWC News Service.

Similar demonstrations of popular affection are renewed as often as people have occasion to wait for Us or come into Our presence in the great halls of the Apostolic Palace.

And it is a special consolation not only to have proof of how the great throng which seeks Us, calls upon Us and keeps up its applause, is made up principally of the youth of every class, throbbing with devout veneration, and a lively and untarnished enthusiasm, but to be assured that these young people are ready and energetic, to a greater extent than the old and the middle-aged, in the defense of, and in doing honor to, the legacy of Christ, the glorious and everlasting King of Peoples of all time.

A TRIBUTE OF RESPECT TO THE REVERED MEMORY OF THE "PASTOR ANGELICUS"

(II) These first respectful expressions of homage for the new Pope in no way detract from the continuation of the universal grief which accompanied to the threshold of Heaven the pure and blessed soul of Our immediate predecessor, Pius XII. On the contrary, it is to him that they are in great part due. It was especially to Pius XII and to the unfathomable grace of which he availed himself in the course of a great pontificate of nearly 20 years that belongs the merit of having poured out upon the flock of Christ the enlightening treasures of heavenly wisdom and the burning fervor of pastoral zeal.

The lowly son of the people who, in the turn of events not only human but also divine, has been called by Divine Providence to take his place—"I have lifted up one chosen from my people"[1]—has no other aim save to urge Christians along that saving path of goodness and mercy, which both uplifts and encourages him. Everything then contributes to a mitigation of the sorrow felt for the death of our father and Pontiff, whom We already like to regard as joined in Heaven with God's saints, and from there also, to be dispensing renewed strength to those Christians who survive him, and who will continue to venerate for generations his beloved and sacred memory.

---

[1] *Psalm* 88:20.

HIS NINETEEN CHRISTMAS MESSAGES, A MONUMENT TO HIS WISDOM AND APOSTOLIC ZEAL

(III) On the occasion of the annual celebrations for the holy feast of Christmas, it was the practice of His Holiness Pope Pius XII to transform the simple and long customary exchange of friendly greetings into a timely discourse filled with rich significance. In it he would explain, with a depth and breadth of theological and mystical insight skillfully directed at practice, his deepest thoughts as Supreme Pontiff regarding the changing circumstances of discipline and often of the lack of it, in the personal, domestic, civic and social spheres. Modern inventions for the communication of thought and speech brought the teaching and the appeal of the Pope directly to every part of the earth. By those means he invited the submission of many thoughtful men of upright conscience by proposing recourse to serious meditation and to a keen and exact appreciation of, and distinction between, truth and error, between what is most attractive and what is a fallacious and dangerous temptation bringing about disorder and ruin.

While preparing Ourselves for this personal meeting in preparation for Christmas, it seemed to Us impossible to do anything better than to listen to the echoes of those discourses or radio messages to the entire world of our late Holy Father, Pius XII. Even the mere fact of recalling them seemed to Us a tribute worthy of him and of the occasion, since in the house deprived of the presence of its former father now gone to eternity, it brings comfort to the devoted children gathered around the apparently extinguished hearth, to recall his beloved voice, his treasured sayings, his salutary warnings.

What light, and how soothing to the spirit merely to listen, even from afar, to his utterance! From 1939 to 1957 there are 19 radio messages, each one a masterpiece of theological, juridical, ascetical, political and social learning. Each and every discourse was set in the splendor of that doctrine which has for its central theme Jesus of Bethlehem; for its inspiration, the great fire of pastoral zeal for souls and nations; for its chief point of guidance, the mysterious star which proclaims the eternal truth of the spiritual and every form of life, and of the history of persons and nations.

The series begins—at Christmas of 1939—with the description of the fundamental points for the peaceful co-existence of nations. It proceeds in 1940 with the prerequisites for a new order in Europe; in 1941, those for the new international order. In 1942 the internal order of states and nations is dealt with. In 1943 the speech is about the light from the Star of Bethlehem for the disillusioned, the hopeless and the faithful, along with the principles for a program of peace.

In 1944, in the sixth year of the war, there was set forth the problem of democracy and light is cast upon it. In the years which follow, peace is abundantly given a place of honor. In 1945, 1946, 1947 and 1948 it is always peace, considered from different points of view.

In 1949 the proclamation of the Holy Year was explained, a year which he wished to be one of the Great Return and the Great Forgiveness. Then in 1950 was resumed the theme of the peace of nations, internal and external, and in 1951, the Church and peace. In 1952 there follows a moving account of mankind in misery and the strengthening of Christ. In 1953 we have an accurate and revealing document on mechanical progress in the world and peace. In 1954 there was explained the co-existence of men in fear, in error and in truth. In 1955 are described the attitudes of modern man when confronted with the feast of Christmas and Christ in the historical and social life of mankind. In 1956 we have the dignity and the limitations of human nature: a reasoned argument replete with pure doctrine and with applications to actual conditions in the life of individuals. Finally, in 1957, the subject is Christ, source and guarantee of harmony in the world—wonderful and consoling pages which sum up the whole thought of Pope Pius XII.

His glorious and noble tomb in the Vatican basilica, near that of St. Peter, cannot receive a more splendid and more fitting adornment than the titles of these Christmas radio messages of the years of his pontificate.

The spirit, also, is repeatedly moved whenever the thought occurs that these are only 19 examples of a teaching which is with difficulty contained within a set of 20 volumes: truly, a marvelous doctrinal and pastoral activity, that gives to Pius XII's name an assured place with posterity. Moreover, quite apart from any official declaration which would be premature, the threefold title of Eminent Teacher, Light of Holy Church, Lover of the Divine Law well befits the blessed memory of him, the Pontiff of our favored age.

THE GREAT COMMANDMENT AND TEACHING OF OUR LORD FOR HIS CHURCH IN EACH RECURRING YEAR: UNITY AND PEACE

(IV) For one wishing to sum up in two comprehensive words the living substance of this teaching contained in the 19 Christmas messages and 20 volumes of the rich collection of written and spoken words of Pius XII, it is enough to utter these words: unity and peace.

These words support the entire world from its creation to the consummation of its history: in this there is unity. They express the beneficent and fruitful light of the grace of Christ, Son of God and Redeemer and Glorifier of mankind: in this there is peace. The only condition required on the part of man is good will, which is also a grace of God, but which must be freely conditioned upon man's response. The lack of this response of human freedom to God's call to the service of His merciful designs constitutes the most terrible problem of human history and of the lives of individual men and peoples.

The commemoration of the birth of Jesus never ceases to renew each year the announcement of the same doctrine, and on the same theme: unity and peace. Unfortunately human history records at the beginnings a bloody episode: brother killed brother. The law of love, which the Creator had imprinted on the heart of man, was torn by an evil which suddenly led humanity onto the paths of injustice and disorder. Unity was broken and it took nothing less than the intervention of the Son of God Himself, who accepted through obedience to reconstruct the holy bonds of the human family, so soon compromised, and the price of its reconstitution was His own blood.

This reconstitution still goes on. Jesus founded a Church impressing upon it the character of unity, achieved by gathering to itself all human nations under its immense shelter which extends from sea to sea. O why could not this unity of the Catholic Church, heeded directly and through the divine call to the interests of social peace, why could it not be applied also to the recomposition of racial differences and the differences between nations mutually attentive to the purposes of living together in society, confirmed by laws of justice and by fraternity?

Here enters the principle, familiar to believers, that the good service of God and of His justice is also favorable to the advantage of the civil community of peoples and of nations.

The recollection of some ten years or so ago is still alive in Our spirit, when certain representatives of the Orthodox Church—as they call themselves—of the Near East proposed, with the practical cooperation of certain governments, to provide for greater national unity, undertaking it with the agreement between various Christian confessions of diverse Rite and diverse history.

Unfortunately the current of overriding concrete interests and nationalistic preoccupations rendered fruitless those intentions, which were in themselves good and worthy of respect. And the vexing problem of the broken unity of the heritage of Christ still remains and obstacles still hinder its solution. It will be a long road of burdening difficulties and uncertainties. The sadness of this sorrowful observation does not arrest, nor will it arrest, We hope to God, the effort of Our soul to continue the loving invitation to Our dear separated brothers, who also carry on their forehead the name of Christ and who read His holy and blessed Gospel, and who are not insensible to the inspirations of religious piety, of beneficent and blessed charity.

Recalling the words of Our predecessors—from Leo XIII to Pius XII, through St. Pius X, Benedict XV and Pius XI—who extended from the Apostolic Chair the invitation to unity, permit Us—by which We mean to say, will you permit Us?—to say that We intend to pursue humbly, but fervently Our duty urged upon Us by the words and example of Jesus, the Divine Good Shepherd, which He continues to speak to Us in the vision of the harvests which whiten the vast missionary fields: "Them also I must bring . . . and there shall be one fold and one shepherd";[2] and which He speaks to Us in the prayer raised to His Father in the last hours, in the imminence of the supreme sacrifice: "That all may be one, even as thou, Father, in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in Us that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."[3]

It is these calls, so profound and so sublime, upon which peace turns, the peace of Christmas, the peace of Christ; the desire of

[2] *John,* 10:16.

[3] *John,* 17:21.

souls and of peoples, the complement of every grace of Heaven and of earth; the peace which, wherever and as long as it is missing, leaves the world in agony; and wherever it is present, as the Angels of Bethlehem announced, fills the spirit and the heart with exultation.

My Lord Cardinal, your so noble and loving greeting, offered to Us in the name of all the most eminent Cardinals, both the elders and the newly created, and in the name of all the Roman prelates, We take pleasure in repeating, touches Us strongly from the first word to the last and again We thank you for it.

The birth of the Lord is an announcement of unity and of peace in all the world. It is a renewed pledge of good will put to the service of order, of justice and of fraternity toward all Christian nations, come together in a common desire for understanding, of great respect for the holy liberty of collective life in the three-fold religious, civil and social order.

There has been referred to Us the gracious and genial project of the Italian radio-television (network) to make resound in sweet unison at the first stroke of the Christmas Festival the sound of the humble parish bells where this new Servant of the Servants of the Lord who speaks was born and baptized, with the bell of Venice, whence this person departed to undertake the unexpected duty which Providence entrusted to Him, and with the most solemn bells of St. Peter's in the Vatican. They are to be joined in festive harmony with all the harmonious voice of the world to make one single universal announcement, for one single invitation to unity and peace.

May the Lord grant that this important invitation may be listened to everywhere. In some parts of the world no ear is given to this invitation. Where the notions most sacred to Christian civilization are smothered and extinguished, where the spiritual and divine order is weakened and where people succeed in weakening the concept of supernatural life, it is a very sad duty to recognize evil intent, the proofs of which are now common knowledge.

Though wishing to be courteous in judging, in excusing and in assessing the seriousness of the atheistic and materialistic conditions to which several nations have been and are subjected, and which groan under their weight, yet one cannot deny the slavery of individuals and masses, the slavery of thought and the slavery of labor. The Holy Book tells of the Tower of Babel which was built in the first centuries of history on the plain of Sennaar and which ended in confusion. Other such towers are being built even now in several regions of the earth and they will certainly end as the first. But the illusion for many is great and ruin is threatening. Only unity and a strengthening of the apostolate of truth and true human and Christian fraternity will be able to halt the impending grave dangers.

We have already had occasion in recent days to single out the gravest facts about the liberty of the Church in several parts of the world—for example, that immense land of China. What has happened for years in the vast territories behind the Iron Curtain is almost too well known to need further illustration.

There is nothing martial or violent in the attitudes of men of faith. It is necessary, however, to be watchful in the night that gathers: to take account of the deceits and to number, first, the enemies of God and then to number ourselves and to take part in every defense of Christian principles, which are now and always the breastplate of true justice.

Christmas time: it is a time of good works and of warm charity. The exercise of these, which gives substance and meaning to civilization, which takes its norm from Christ, has the fourteen works of mercy for its object. Christmas must mark the maximum of religious and peaceful fervor for this overflowing of unity and charity toward one's brothers, the needy and the sick, toward the little ones, and toward suffering of every kind and every name.

May this be a constructive Christmas. May as many as hear this voice over the airwaves, rising above the harmony of the bells to invite all to union and to prayer in homage to the humble person of the new Pope, may they wish to reenforce their good intentions for the sanctification of the New Year so that it may become for all the world a year of justice, of blessings, of goodness and of peace.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE EAST. By Raymond Etteldorf. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. 184. $3.75.

Monsignor Etteldorf is an official of the Roman curia, attached to the Oriental Congregation. During the course of his work, he has had occasion to visit the Catholic communities in Jordan, Israel, Egypt, Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey. In the present volume he has given our American priests the privilege of sharing what he learned on these visits.

There is no readily available source other than *The Catholic Church in the Middle East* for most of the information set down in this book. And information of this kind is vitally important for all, particularly for Catholics, at this particular time. It is imperative now that we should know how the true Church is faring in this turbulent and crisis-ridden part of our world.

The author of *The Catholic Church in the Middle East* is the former editor of *The Witness,* the official publication of the Archdiocese of Dubuque. His book shows his competence as a writer. He has managed to concentrate a maximum of vitally important information into a brief and delightfully written book. The personal touch renders his volume not only valuable, but most pleasant reading. *The Catholic Church in the Middle East* deserves and will most probably obtain a very extensive distribution.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THEOLOGY: A BASIC SYNTHESIS FOR THE COLLEGE. General Editor: Francis L. B. Cunningham, O.P. Vol. I: GOD AND HIS CREATION. By William B. Murphy, O.P., Thomas C. Donlan, O.P., John S. Reidy, O.P., Francis B. Cunningham, O.P. Dubuque: The Priory Press, 1958. Pp. xviii + 516. $4.95.

THEOLOGY: A BASIC SYNTHESIS FOR THE COLLEGE. General Editor: Francis L. B. Cunningham, O.P. Vol. III: CHRIST AND HIS SACRAMENTS. By Thomas C. Donlan, O.P., Francis L. B. Cunningham, O. P., Augustine Rock, O.P. Dubuque: The Priory Press. 1958. Pp. xviii + 630. $4.95.

These two well-printed and attractive volumes are part of a series of college texts in theology by the Dominican Fathers of the Province of St. Albert the Great. Another volume on the moral part of theology is projected for next year. A supplementary volume entitled *Towards Marriage in Christ* has already appeared.

In a foreword addressed to students the editor says: "This is a *theology* book. It is one of a series which attempts to bring to you the deeper, more adult knowledge of divine and human truth. As a Christian leader, you have need of this knowledge; as a Christian student you, in your importance, have a right to it." In carrying out this aim the authors have followed the order and content of the *Summa theologica*. This does not mean that they have merely summarized the text, question by question. They have, rather, presented its theological doctrine in a clear and simple style suited to a modern textbook, all the while preserving the exact order of theology. The result is a textbook admirably adapted to the needs of the college student. The individual chapters do not give an exhaustive treatment of each subject. This was not the intention, for, as the editor states, the series was not intended to be a "self-taught project," but demanded a teacher to guide the student and fill out the text. While sufficient attention is given throughout to the sources of Scripture and Tradition, the principal emphasis is placed on working out the theological doctrine.

An indication of how completely these volumes treat the matter of theology may be seen from the titles of the chapters.

The volume *God and His Creation* treats in sixteen chapters the following subjects: the sources and nature of theology; the existence and attributes of God (with individual chapters on God's knowledge, will, providence and predestination); the Trinity, God the Creator; the Angels; the creation and nature of man; the governance of the universe. A general bibliography of works in English is given at the beginning of the volume, and at the end of each chapter there is a short bibliography of material likely to be found in college libraries. At the end of the volume there is a glossary of terms and a good index. In each chapter there is a short introduction to the subject and an outline of the material; then, a discussion of the problems and the material; finally, a summary and conclusion.

In approaching such extremely difficult matters as the attributes of God or the Trinity, the temptation is to pass over these briefly, "simplifying" or omitting what is considered too difficult. This procedure in a subject as difficult as theology has oftentimes the effect of negating the purpose of teaching theology at all. Fortunately, these authors have presented all the material and left it to the teacher to determine the amount of emphasis to be given each problem. In this regard it should be added that each of the authors is obviously thoroughly acquainted with the theology of his particular section. This fact has enabled them to clarify, if not simplify, the difficult parts. Some reservations might be made regarding sections of the chapter on the nature of theology. Here, the discussion on the scientific and sapiential functions of theology (apparently following Muniz) is not clear. The same judgment may be made regarding the use of the term "object" and "subject" (in one place the subject of theology is said to be the human mind). The division of theology into its functions (p. 55) is more complicated than enlightening. The division of the material of theology (pp. 68-69), taken from St. Thomas, is much more to the point.

Christ, and His Sacraments (the third volume in the completed series) treats in fifteen chapters the material of the third part of the *Summa theologica:* Christ the Saviour, and the Sacraments. The treatment begins with an introductory section on the dogma of the Incarnation, its foundation in Sacred Scripture and the history of its definition by the Councils. This is followed by six chapters on the fittingness of the Incarnation; the nature of the hypostatic union; the perfections and imperfections of Christ's human nature; the consequences of the Incarnation; Christ's life and ministry, and his passion, death and resurrection. Appended to this is a chapter on Mary the Mother of God. In the remaining part of the volume, the sacraments are treated in the traditional order: one chapter on the sacraments in general, one chapter for each sacrament and one chapter on the Mass. Two supplementary chapters, one on the Mystical Body, the other on death, judgment, heaven and hell complete the work. There is an appendix containing an outline harmony of the Gospels and an index.

In this volume the style, manner of setting forth the material, and the bibliographies are uniform with the first volume. And, it should be added, the presentation is of the same high quality.

If the volume to come matches the excellence of these two, this series will be more than just a welcome addition to the existing material in this field. It will be an outstanding achievement. By a careful explanation of terms, clear presentation, and precise order these authors have avoided the mistake of writing a text too dense and difficult for those who come to theology without benefit of any previous formal training. On the other hand they have not been so preoccupied with the needs of uninitiated college students that they have thought it necessary to redesign theology around some new "integrating principle," simply because it is intended for lay students. This text in the hands of a competent teacher should produce a more profound understanding of the truths of faith than has been possible on the college level until now.

David A. Dillon

THE MASS AND LITURGICAL REFORM. By John L. Murphy. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956. Pp. xi + 340. $5.95.

The Mass and Liturgical Reform is a book that should be known and read by all priests who desire to obtain a better understanding and appreciation of the liturgical movement, and of its importance in the life of all the members of the Mystical Body of Christ. The new Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on Sacred Music and Sacred Liturgy (Sept. 3, 1958) makes Father Murphy's book all the more timely and valuable. Certainly one of the most striking emphases noted in this Instruction is the strong recommendation and commendation of the active, intelligent participation of the laity in both the sung Mass and the read Mass (nn. 22-34). This participation must be both interior and exterior, combining pious attention of the soul and affections of the heart with external vocal responses, prayers and chants, especially in "the parts of the Mass proper to the faithful," which belong to them in the liturgy (n. 31).

A careful reading of *The Mass and Liturgical Reform* will give to all pastors of souls the knowledge, the historical background, the inspiration and sympathetic attitudes so essential for understanding the aims proposed by this recent Instruction. The book is divided into three sections: Faith and Liturgy (88 pages); Liturgical Reform (147 pages); and The Vernacular (86 pages), with a splendid, working Index of fourteen pages. The three sections are intimately linked together in a masterly, authoritative exposition of the Church's liturgy in relation to the glory of God and the spiritual life of the faithful; to religious instruction; to converts; and to the everyday events of modern life.

Father Murphy combines deep scholarship with a clarity and facility of expression which makes the reader eager to follow one thought after another to the end of the book, and then go back to enjoy again the highlights in the wealth of information stored up in its 340 pages. The book is not simply a series of pious reflections on the Mass, nor a collection of personal impressions in regard to the problem of liturgical reform. It is a solid, serious study of a highly important question in the modern Church. He makes superb use of the monumental studies of such scholars as Jungmann, Ellard, Dix, Klauser, Murray and Schmidt. He offers their findings in an interesting, clear and informative manner, together with his own calm, objective presentation of the pros and cons of liturgical progress and reform.

In the section on faith and liturgy, Father Murphy indicates two prerequisites for anyone who wishes to understand and appreciate the liturgy today. First, a vivid realization of the Church as the living

Body of Christ; second, a knowledge of the historical development of the Roman Rite. To these two, he writes, a third requirement must be added for those who would appreciate the purposes of liturgical reform as outlined in *Mediator Dei* and the more recent Instruction: namely, a well-developed sensitivity to the pastoral needs of the hour.

In the section on liturgical reform, which flows logically from the preceding, he develops, expands and expounds with the skill of an expert the principles outlined in the first section, making practical applications to twentieth-century conditions in the life of the Church, with special reference to the problems of participation on the part of the faithful. He points up the fact that the Sacrifice of the Mass is at one and the same time the Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifice of the Church, and that we may not treat the Sacrifice of the Church as a matter of secondary moment. The Sacrifice of the Head of the Mystical Body belongs also to His members, to all of them. Christ places His Sacrifice in the hands of the faithful so that they might offer it to the Father in union with Him.

In the third section, Father Murphy treats of the controversial question of the extent and value of the vernacular in the liturgy. He does so in a calm, objective and historical manner. He marshals the arguments pro and con fairly and fully, and allows the enlightened reader to draw his own conclusions. He clears up many misunderstandings current today about the history of language in the liturgy; about the decisions of the Council of Trent relative to the use of the vernacular; and concerning the present status of the question. He points out, quoting Father Schmidt: "Four centuries after the Council, the vernacular language lies at the very *center* of general interest." He examines also the value as well as the shortcomings of vernacular missals in promoting active, intelligent participation of the faithful.

The question of liturgical language which we face today must be discussed in the light of modern man rather than his medieval counterpart. Father Murphy modestly concludes his excellent work with the "hope that from these loose ends, we may be able to gather a clearer picture of the problems we must sooner or later pause to solve."

A study of *The Mass and Liturgical Reform* would richly repay every priest interested in the aims of the modern liturgical movement, a movement called by Pius XII "a sign of God's providential dispositions at the present time, of the movement of the Holy Spirit in the Church, to draw men more closely to the mysteries of faith and the treasures of grace which are derived from active participation of the faithful in the liturgical life."

ROBERT J. SHERRY

LEXIKON FÜR THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE, vols. I and II, edited by Josef Hofer and Karl Rahner. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1957, 1958. $21.60 each in cloth binding ($24.20 in leather).

The announcement of a new edition of a well-known work will most frequently raise the question of whether it amounts to much more than a reprinting of the older edition, involving only a few non-essential changes here and there in the text. In the case of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* it must, therefore, be pointed out from the start that it definitely is *not* a simple reprint. Practically every article has been entirely rewritten, many new subjects are treated, yet the work retains the form and general approach of the original.

When the need for a new printing of the *Lexikon* was realized, it was also seen that so much had taken place in the field of Catholic scholarship since the first edition (1930-38) that something more radical was needed. Josef Hofer and Karl Rahner thereupon assumed the task at hand.

The result is a magnificent gift to the Catholic world. In its revised form the *Lexikon,* already a standard reference work, has become an even more serviceable set, well written and well printed. It is intended that it should give quick references to important points of doctrine and history, and at the same time serve as a starting-point for further study on each particular item. It achieves both purposes admirably.

We can gain some notion of the changes by a simple comparison of the size of the two editions. Like the first edition, the second will also have ten volumes, but they are far larger. Volume One, for example, amounted to 992 columns in the first edition; the present volume comes to 1272 columns. Volume Two has increased from 1024 to 1256 columns.

To enhance its general appeal, there has been a judicious rearrangement of the articles. Certain subjects of more limited appeal have been shortened, while other more basic topics have been given considerably extended treatment. This has greatly increased the value of the work for the entire Catholic world. The treatment of the Last Supper, for example, has been extended over three columns, the notion of "character" has been treated in four additional columns. More general themes, such as the meaning of "Barock" or "Byzantine," have been given far more thorough treatment. The articles on "Abraham" and "Adam" are discussed in the light of more recent biblical scholarship; so also the article on evolution. Throughout, of course, the consistently high scholarship of the first edition continues to be evident.

To make the *Lexikon* more useful for the serious student, additional references to the best books and articles concerning each topic have been added; they are brought up to the very year of printing. It is especially noteworthy for English readers that scarcely a page passes in which large numbers of English books and articles are not listed; the same is true of the best in the other modern languages. The ***Lexikon*** is by no means a brief summary of German writings; it sums up the best of Catholic scholarship throughout the world. It is interesting to note that among the collaborators are listed a good number of writers not only from England and Ireland, but also from America—Gerald Ellard, Robert North, John Quasten, among others.

All of this simply indicates the broad viewpoint of these volumes and their extreme usefulness for Catholics in all countries. It is a set that should be close at hand for anyone interested in things Catholic: it is scholarly, it is precise and to the point, it opens the door to further study, and it is very much up to date.

JOHN L. MURPHY

SAINT CATHERINE LABOURE OF THE MIRACULOUS MEDAL. By Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1958. Pp. 239. $3.50.

St. Catherine Laboure is known to millions of Catholics as the saint through whom Mary gave the Miraculous Medal to the world. Beyond this, often little is known about her. She was French, a Sister of Charity, and saw the visions of Our Lady when she was a novice. Sister Catherine's identity as the Seer remained unknown during the more than forty years of her humble, diligent work in an old men's home. She died a blessed death. This is the simple sketch with which most are familiar. To bring Mary's medal to the world was undoubtedly St. Catherine's main mission in life, but, as is the case with every saint, her whole life was an example for men of a way to reach the union with God for which we are created. Father Dirvin shows the warm human character of this woman who was chosen for a special mission, and he points out the heroic virtue practiced in very ordinary circumstances which won for her the glory of sainthood.

We are familiar with the picture of the novice Sister kneeling before the vision of the Miraculous Medal and are inclined to think of her as a young recluse shielded from contact with the workaday world with which we are acquainted. This biography shows her as a capable, practical-minded woman, who at the age of twelve successfully managed her father's household, directing the housework and providing the meals for her father, her sister, three brothers (one of whom was an invalid), and thirteen hired men. After ten years as housekeeper in her father's home, she went to Paris to wait on rough laborers in her brother's *bistro* and a few months later stayed for a time in her sister-in-law's finishing school for pampered young society women. This was the background of the Seer of Rue du Bac. And the future was every bit as practical. For forty years she directed the Hospice d'Enghien, a home for old men, serving their meals, mending their clothes, supervising their recreation, calmly maintaining the order of the house even in the time of the Communists' interference in 1871.

This same very practical woman was granted the favor of extraordinary visions, dreams, and supernatural communications. The great vision of the Medal was repeated five times and was anticipated by the vision of Our Lady in the chair when Catherine spoke with her for two hours. Besides this, she viewed the apparition of St. Vincent's heart eight or nine times, beheld Christ as King, saw the mysterious "Cross of Victory," and during the whole time of her novitiate enjoyed the visible presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. She had several prophetic dreams. When she saw Our Lady for the last time, Catherine was promised that she would hear Mary's voice in her prayers. This seems to have continued throughout her life, a familiar and intimate conversation with the Mother of God in prayer.

Father Dirvin has skillfully woven together these various aspects of the life of St. Catherine to form a very readable biography. His style is attractive. Many of the incidents spring to life because of the details which are sketched into the descriptions, details, some of which came from Father Dirvin's personal observation when he visited Paris and Fain-le-moutiers, and others from his careful study of documents and correspondence. The publisher offers the book as a definitive biography but we see from the foreword that this is understood in a broad way. The biography covers everything significant which is recorded about St. Catherine, including much material never previously published. Every statement, we are told, has been fully authenticated. Unfortunately we are not offered that authentication. The work is without reference notes. There is a lengthy bibliography, which presumably includes all the sources for the book. Since Father Dirvin prepared by years of study for the writing of this book, it is regrettable that the scholarly footnotes are absent. Would it not be possible to include them in supplementary pages at the end?

This is the first full-length life of St. Catherine to be published in the United States. It will be an enjoyable and fruitful source of information for the millions of American Catholics who are interested in the devotion to Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal.

NORBERT F. GEIS, C.M.

COME, O HOLY GHOST! By Adrian Lyons, O.F.M. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds Ltd., 1957. Pp. 218. 16/6 Nett.

Any priest who is interested in promoting devotion to the Holy Spirit both in his own spiritual life and among his people will welcome Father Lyons' manual. It comprises both dogma and devotion in two evenly-divided sections.

In the first part, the author gives a popular exposition of such considerations as the Holy Spirit and Christ, the Holy Spirit in the Trinity and the Indwelling. He explains the Thomistic theology of the infused virtues, the gifts and the fruits of the Holy Spirit. Finally, he makes it quite clear that devotion to the Holy Spirit consists in loving surrender to the inspirations of the Sanctifier and has nothing in common with sentimentality.

The second section is an orderly compilation of prayers and novenas to the Holy Spirit. He has already made it clear that love must follow knowledge, and these devotions constitute the approved means of loving the Holy Spirit.

As a whole, the book merits recommendation. Priests will find it an excellent review of the theology of the Holy Spirit and a concise source book for sermons at Pentecost or occasional instructions. It would be a good book to suggest to educated lay people, for whom devotion to the Holy Spirit is generally unappealing and undeveloped.

It is regrettable that Father Lyons is ambiguous on page 23, where he is explaining the term *appropriation*. He says there, "The work of redemption is attributed to the Son, but we have been redeemed by all three." Redemption is, of course, not appropriated to the Son, but proper to Him as Incarnate. Presumably, the author meant that the Incarnation is efficiently caused by the Blessed Trinity.

GEORGE E. ST. LAURENT, C.S.P.

Book Notes

Within the past few weeks The Bruce Publishing Company of Milwaukee has brought out the fourth volume of the famous *Canon Law Digest,* by Fathers T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., and James I. O'Connor, S.J. This volume includes all the officially published documents affecting the interpretation of the Code of Canon Law which appeared during the period 1953-57. Like the previcus volumes, this one does not limit itself to statements and responses published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis.*

This fourth volume contains xi + 529 pages, and sells for $7.50. Its binding is uniform with that of its three predecessors.

In *The Canon Law Digest* American priests have available to them a uniquely valuable instrument of study. The first volume contains all the pertinent documents issued by the Holy See from 1917 until 1933. The second runs from 1933 to 1942, while the third covers the period 1942-53. The first three volumes are the work of Father Bouscaren alone.

This set denitely belongs in every rectory library. Younger priests owe it to themselves and to their ministry to provide themselves with all four volumes.

After the passage of the years, it seems quite obvious now that, of all the literary legacies left to the Church by the great English converts of the nineteenth century, that of Father Frederick William Faber is by far the most valuable. The ever-increasing interest in the writings of the great Oratorian in this country is reflected in the recent publication of two works: *A Father Faber Heritage: Selections from the Writings of Reverend Frederick William Faber,* edited with an Introduction by Sister Mary Mercedes, of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, and the reprint of Father Faber's *The Blessed Sacrament.* The book of selections is published by The Newman Press, at Westminster, Maryland. It is a book of x + 368 pages, and it is priced at $4.75. *The Blessed Sacrament* has been republished by The Peter Reilly Company, of 131 North Thirteenth Street, Philadelphia. It contains 463 pages and it costs $3.95.

A Father Faber Heritage will be invaluable for any young priest who wants a kind of quick introduction into the thought of Father Faber. Sister Mary Mercedes has been most fortunate in the selection of the long texts which go to make up the body of the volume. Her citations effectively bring out the intensely practical and supernatural spiritual teaching bequeathed by Father Faber to the Church he loved so well. The quotation on "Kindness," pp. 135-44, is one of the best things in her book.

The priest who is acquainted with the book of selections from the writings of Father Faber will need no urging to procure and to read *The Blessed Sacrament,* which is obviously one of the best and the most characteristic of all his literary productions.

The publishing house of B. Herder Book Company, of St. Louis and London, has published another edition of the classical *Handbook of Ceremonies for Priests and Seminarians,* by John Baptist Mueller, S.J. Like previous editions, this eighteenth revised edition has been brought completely up to date, in line with pontifical directives issued during the years 1957 and 1958. Fr. Adam C. Ellis, S.J., is the editor of this invaluable work.

The Handbook runs to xviii + 482 pages. It costs $6.50. It is world famous for its accuracy and adequacy. The present edition contains much material hitherto unavailable.

Another classic of the spiritual life which has recently been published is the third volume of the *Summa of the Christian Life,* the book composed of citations from the works of the Venerable Luis de Granada, O.P., translated and adapted by Fr. Jordan Aumann, O.P. The *Summa of the Christian Life* is arranged in the order of the *Summa theologica.* This present volume contains the teachings of Granada which fall within the ambit of the *tertia pars* of St. Thomas' masterpiece. It is the eleventh volume in the *Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality.* It is published by B. Herder Book Company, of St. Louis, and it is priced at $4.75.

Books Received

TOWARDS A NEW WORLD. By R. Lombardi, S.J. Translated and condensed from the Italian. New York: Philosophical Library Publishers, 1958. Pp. xvi + 276. $6.00.

THE HISTORICAL AND MYSTICAL CHRIST. By a group of theologians under the editorship of A. M. Henry, O.P. Translated by Angeline Bouchard. (Theology Library, Volume V.) Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1958. Pp. xviii + 502. $7.50.

CHRIST IN HIS SACRAMENTS. By a group of theologians under the editorship of A. M. Henry, O.P. Translated by Angeline Bouchard. (Theology Library, Volume VI.) Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1958. Pp. xv + 466. $5.95.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME. THE PRAYER OF THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS. By Monsignor A. G. Martimort. Translated by Dom Aldhelm Dean. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1958. Pp. 217. $3.25.

OUR MASS EXPLAINED FROM THE VIEWPOINTS OF HISTORY, THEOLOGY, PIETY. By Monsignor Chevrot. Translated by P. Holland-Smith. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1958. Pp. 241. $3.75.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, OR THE WORKS AND WAYS OF GOD. By Frederick William Faber, D.D. New Edition. Philadelphia: The Peter Reilly Company, 1958. Pp. 463. $3.95.

THE NATURE OF BELIEF. By M. C. Darcy, S.J., M.A. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1958. Pp. 236. $3.95.

WHAT THINK YOU OF CHRIST? By William R. Bonniwell, O.P. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1958. Pp. xi + 199. $3.75.

A STRANGER AT YOUR DOOR. By John J. Powell, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958. Pp. 120. $2.50.